

LICENSING (2003) ACT SUB-COMMITTEE  
APPLICATION FOR AN EXPEDITED/ SUMMARY LICENCE REVIEW  
THE LONGBOW PUBLIC HOUSE, 2 CHURCH STREET, STAPLEFORD

EVIDENCE ON BEHALF OF  
THE CHIEF CONSTABLE OF CAMBRIDGESHIRE

INDEX

	DOCUMENT	PAGE NO
1.	Closure Order made under section 161 of the Licensing Act 2003	1 - 3
2.	Notice of Closure Order	4
3.	Schedule 8 A - Application for the review of a premises licence under section 53A of the Licensing Act 2003	5 - 8
4.	Certificate under section 53A (1) (b) of the Licensing Act 2003	9 - 11
5.	Maps showing street-level crime and ASB October 2011 - March 2012	12 - 25
6.	Map showing location of street-level crime to the Longbow Public House	26
7.	Street Level Crime Data - Frequently Asked Questions/ Issues	27 - 32
8.	Crime and Disorder Report - Longbow, Stapleford	33 - 37
9.	Email from Councillor Charles Nightingale	38
10.	Email from David Pepperal	39
11.	Witness statement of PC 1118 Iain Perry	40 - 46
12.	Witness statement of PC 2333 Smith	47 - 48
13.	Witness statement of DC 770 Skipworth	49
14.	Witness statement of CI Alderson	50
15.	Witness statement of Inspector Kerridge	51 - 54
16.	Witness statement of Witness 1	55 - 56
17.	Witness statement of Witness 2	57 - 58

18.	Witness statement of Witness 3	59 - 60
19.	Witness statement of Witness 4	61 - 62
20.	Witness statement of Juli Stallabrass	63 - 68
21.	CCTV Footage time lines	69 -76

Annex L

[SPECIMEN]

CLOSURE ORDER MADE UNDER SECTION 161 OF THE LICENSING ACT 2003

Date and Time: 25th May 2012

Police Force: Cambridgeshire Constabulary

Name and rank of Senior Police Officer making the order:

Chief Inspector 9091 DC Alderson

Premises to be closed:

The Longbow, Church Street, Stapleford  
Cambridgeshire

Period of closure (until - time and date):

25th May 2012 : 20:08.

Reason (grounds) for Closure:

Wish immediate to be disorder on or in the  
vicinity of the premise and closure is necessary  
in the interest of public safety

Attention is drawn to the attached Notes which form part of this order.

Name of person to whom notice of the order has been given and his or her capacity in relation to the premises: GRAEME

MR GRAEME ~~FORSTER~~ FORSTER

Signature of Person to whom notice of the order has been given:



## 177 Guidance issued under section 162 of the Licensing Act 2003

### Notes for specimen closure order:

A senior police officer has decided to make this closure order under the terms of section 161 of the Licensing Act 2003, requiring the relevant premises specified in the order to be closed for the period of time specified in the order.

Your attention is drawn to section 161(6) of the 2003 Act. This makes it an offence for a person, without reasonable excuse, to permit relevant premises to be open in contravention of this closure order or any extension of it, and any person found guilty of such an offence shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £20,000 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months or to both.

By virtue of section 171(2) and (3) of the 2003 Act, relevant premises are to be regarded as open, for the purposes of this order, if any person other than the holder of the premises licence for the premises, any designated premises supervisor, the premises user in connection with a temporary event notice, a manager of the premises, any person who usually lives at the premises or any member of the family of any of the former, enters the premises and buys, or is otherwise supplied with food or drink or any item usually sold on the premises or, while he is on the premises, they are used for the provision of regulated entertainment.

## Sections 162 – 168 of the Licensing Act 2003

This part of the closure order now explains the effects of sections 162 – 168 of the 2003 Act as required by section 161(4)(d) of that Act.

### Initial hearing

- The senior police officer who made the closure order is under a statutory duty to apply to the magistrates' court for it to consider the order, or any extension of it, as soon as reasonably practicable after it comes into force.
- The magistrate's court must consider the closure order made by a senior police officer as soon as practicable after receiving the application, by holding a hearing and determining whether to exercise its powers under section 165 of the 2003 Act.
  - Under law on human rights, you are entitled to attend the hearing, to be legally represented, and to make representations to the court before any decision is taken. The chief executive to the magistrates' court will be able to advise you about the details of the procedures which apply in your area.
  - A discretion is provided for the magistrates to revoke the order and any extension of it, if it is still in force; or to order that the premises remain closed or be closed until the a review of the licence has taken place; or to order that the premises remain closed until a review of the licence has taken place but subject to such exceptions or conditions that they may specify. The last of these powers would enable the court to allow premises to re-open but subject to certain new terms and conditions which they may decide to impose.
  - When deciding whether the premises should be allowed to re-open or remain closed, the court must consider whether closure of the premises is necessary in the interests of public safety to prevent disorder or likely disorder (where the closure order was made for this reason) or to prevent further public nuisance caused by noise (where the closure order was made for this reason).



#### 178 Guidance issued under section 182 of the Licensing Act 2003

- It is an offence for any person who permits the premises to open in contravention of an order made by the magistrates for the closure of the premises, and the 2003 Act provides for an offender on conviction to be liable to a fine not exceeding £20,000 or to three months imprisonment or to both.
  - It is an offence for any person who fails to comply with or does an act in contravention of any order made by the magistrates in relation to the premises in these proceedings, and provides for an offender on conviction to be liable to a fine not exceeding £20,000 or to three months imprisonment or to both.
  - Where, for whatever reason, the courts are unable to consider a closure order before it expires, the senior police officer concerned may extend the order for up to another period of 24 hours if certain circumstances obtain. These are that the officer reasonably believes that the closure of the premises continues to be necessary in the interests of public safety to prevent disorder, or likely disorder or to prevent further public nuisance caused by noise. Such extensions can be made on an indefinite number of occasions.
  - The senior police officer is required to give notice to the holder of the premises licence for the premises, or any designated premises supervisor, or the premises user in connection with a temporary event notice, or a manager of the premises of such extensions of the closure order.
    - The senior police officer may cancel his closure order or any extension of it at any time after he has issued it, but before it has been considered by the court. If he does so, the court must still consider the closure order originally served, and the licensing authority will still be obliged to review the premises licence.
    - The senior police officer is required to cancel the order if he reasonably believes that closure of the premises is no longer necessary in the interests of public safety to prevent disorder or to prevent further public nuisance; and is required to give notice to the holder of the premises licence for the premises, or any designated premises supervisor, or the premises user in connection with a temporary event notice, or a manager of the premises when he decides to cancel it.

#### Review hearing

- The licensing authority must review the premises licence in respect of the premises no later than 28 days after it is notified of the magistrates' courts' determination. The authority is empowered, if necessary to promote the licensing objectives, to modify the conditions of the premises licence, exclude a licensable activity from the scope of the licence, remove the designated premises supervisor from the licence, suspend the licence for a period not exceeding three months or revoke the licence. Their consideration is not confined solely to the incident which gave rise to the service of the closure order. They may examine any issues which are relevant to the promotion of the licensing objectives.
  - Where a decision has been made to revoke the premises licence, the decision has no effect until the expiry of the time permitted for appealing against the decision; and if an appeal is made until the appeal is disposed of.

CLOSURE ORDER MADE UNDER SECTION 161 OF THE LICENSING ACT 2003

Date and Time: 28 May 2012

Police Force: Cambridgeshire Constabulary

Name and rank of Police Officer applying for the order: Chief Inspector 2091 Chief Inspector Alderson

Premises to be closed: The Longbow Public House, 2 Church Street, Stapleford, Cambridgeshire, CB2 5DS

Period of closure (until – time and date):  
00:00 on 20 June 2012 unless lifted <sup>by</sup> Licensing Authority prior to this time.

Reason (grounds) for Closure: Likely to be immediate disorder on or in the vicinity of the premises and closure is necessary in the interests of public safety.

Name of person to whom notice of the order has been given and his or her capacity in relation to the premises: Mr Graeme Richard George FOSTER  
<sup>R</sup>  
<sup>FR</sup>

Signature of Person to whom notice of the order has been given:

  
.....

Signature of Applicant:

  
2091  
.....

Signature of Justice of Peace:

  
.....

Date and Time: 25 May 2012 5pm  
.....



SCHEDULE 8A Regulation 16A

**Application for the review of a premises licence  
under section 53A of the Licensing Act 2003  
(premises associated with serious crime, serious disorder or both)**

**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 the 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.

**I, Chief Inspector Darren Alderson, on behalf of the chief officer of police for the police area apply for the review of a premises licence under S53A of the Licensing Act 2003.**

**1. Premises details:**

**Postal address of premises, or if none or not known, Ordnance Survey map reference or description:**

The Longbow Public House, Church Street, Stapleford

**2. Premises licence details:**

**Name of premises licence holder (if known):**

Graeme Forster of 7 Church Street Stapleford

**Number of premises licence (if known):**

Not Known

**3. Certificate under section 53A(1)(b) of the Licensing Act**

I confirm that a certificate has been given by a senior member of the police force for the police area above that in his opinion the above premises are associated with serious crime or serious disorder or both, and the certificate accompanies this application.



**4. Details of association of the above premises with serious crime, serious disorder or both:**  
[Please read guidance note 2]

The Longbow pub has been associated with most reported violent crime (and criminal damage) offences in the village of Stapleford over the last six months. Although the numbers are low, offences and incidents are disproportionately associated with the pub. In Stapleford generally there are low numbers of violent crime and criminal damage offences and of anti-social behaviour incidents however there were four violent crime and two criminal damage offences and eight ASB incidents over a six month period to 07/05/2012.

Police dealings with the pub go back many months beyond and the following examples indicate that serious crime and serious disorder have been associated with the premises, and been unchecked by the licensee for some time. They demonstrate a failure by the licensee to uphold the licensing objectives "to prevent crime and disorder, maintain public safety, prevent public nuisance, and protect children from harm".

Police have received intelligence from a number of sources over many months of drug use and now increasingly drug dealing taking place on the premises. The number of people who have convictions for drugs use and/or supply who frequent the premises is notable. The most recent intelligence from May 2012 is increasingly focused on class A drug dealing and indicates a worsening situation in the pub which the licensee is either unwilling or unable to address.

Police have secured CCTV evidence of a fight taking place in the pub on 6/9/11. The fight takes place over 20mins approximately both inside and outside the pub causing the police to be called attend. On arrival the two protagonists denied that there had been any disorder. There were no other customers in the pub and the witness outside wished to remain anonymous. The CCTV was not viewed at that time. Mr Forster however was present throughout. He failed to intervene and in fact served both males with more alcohol throughout the episode.

On 8/9/11 officers had cause to make enquiries at the pub looking for the suspect in a robbery investigation who was known to drink there. The suspect was located at the bar by the two officers and invited to speak with them outside. On being arrested the suspect offered resistance to the two female officers who requested further backup. Retrospectively, police have secured CCTV footage from inside the premises which shows the officers' struggle with the suspect in the entrance hall. It also shows apparently shows Mr Forster arrive on the premises, walk through the bar area, look through the glass into the entrance where the officers were struggling with the suspect and fail to offer them any assistance.

On 28/1/12 police took report of an assault which had occurred outside the pub the night before. The victim was a 17year old who had been in the pub with other celebrating an 18<sup>th</sup> birthday party. A confrontation took place outside between the youngster and another customer which resulted in the victim receiving a punch to the jaw. Initial enquiries were made at the pub to identify the suspect and the following record was made on the file "landlord identified \*\*\*\*\* as fitting description and drinking in the pub on 27/1/12, not willing to make statement". CCTV footage was seized and local officers were able to identify the suspect from that themselves removing the need to pursue a statement from Mr Forster. However his failure to provide a statement at the outset again must be noted.

The licensee has had numerous offers of advice and support from local police. He has failed to engage with the local Pubwatch scheme and allowed people banned by other licensees into his pub.

The police are of the opinion that it is in the interest of public protection that these premises are prevented from operating as a matter of urgency. The summary above clearly outlines a persistent problem of violent incidents, and escalating concern about drug use and supply. The police have no confidence in the Licensees ability or willingness to address these matters. With a forthcoming Bank Holidays and warmer weather likely to result in increased custom at the premises the police feel that an expedited review is necessary rather than a review under under Section 51 Licensing Act 2003.

**Signature of applicant:**

**Date:**

**Capacity:** Chief Inspector D Alderson, South Cambs Area Commander

**Contact details for matters concerning this application:**

**Address:**

**Telephone:**

**Email:**

**Notes for guidance:**

1. A certificate of the kind mentioned in the form must accompany the application in order for it to be valid under the terms of the Licensing Act 2003. The certificate must explicitly state the senior officer's opinion that the premises in question are associated with serious crime, serious disorder or both.  
Serious crime is defined by reference to section 81 of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000. In summary, it means:
  - conduct that amounts to one or more criminal offences for which a person who has attained the age of eighteen and has no previous convictions could reasonably be expected to be sentenced to imprisonment for a term of three years or more; or
  - conduct that amounts to one or more criminal offences and involves the use of violence, results in substantial financial gain or is conduct by a large number of persons in pursuit of a common purpose.Serious disorder is not defined in legislation, and so bears its ordinary English meaning.
2. Briefly describe the circumstances giving rise to the opinion that the above premises are associated with serious crime, serious disorder, or both. "



FILED *CA1*

ANNEX B

Det. Superintendent Paul Fullwood  
Cambridgeshire Constabulary  
Police Headquarters  
Hinchingbrooke Park  
Huntingdon

**CERTIFICATE UNDER SECTION 53A(1)(b) OF THE LICENSING ACT 2003**

I hereby certify that in my opinion the premises described below are associated with serious crime / serious disorder / both serious crime and serious disorder<sup>1</sup>.

*Premises*<sup>2</sup>:  
The Longbow Public House, Church Street in Stapleford

Premises licence number (if known): Not Known


Name of premises supervisor (if known): Graeme Forster

I am a Superintendent<sup>3</sup> in the Cambridgeshire police force.

I am giving this certificate because I am of the opinion that other procedures under the Licensing Act are inappropriate in this case, because<sup>4</sup>:

The Longbow pub has been associated with most reported violent crime (and criminal damage) offences in the village of Stapleford over the last six months. Although the numbers are low, offences and incidents are disproportionately associated with the pub. In Stapleford generally there are low numbers of violent crime and criminal damage offences and of anti-social behaviour incidents however there were four violent crime and two criminal damage offences and eight ASB incidents over a six month period to 07/05/2012. Police dealings with the pub go back many months beyond and the following examples indicate that serious crime and serious disorder have been

- <sup>1</sup> Delete as applicable.
- <sup>2</sup> Include business name and address and any other relevant identifying details.
- <sup>3</sup> Insert rank of officer giving the certificate, which must be superintendent or above.
- <sup>4</sup> Give a brief description of why other procedures such as a standard review process are thought to be inappropriate, e.g. the degree of seriousness of the crime and/or disorder, the past history of compliance in relation to the premises concerned.



associated with the premises, and been unchecked by the licensee for some time. They demonstrate a failure by the licensee to uphold the licensing objectives "to prevent crime and disorder, maintain public safety, prevent public nuisance, and protect children from harm". I have been provided a detailed briefing of events that cause me grave concerns around this Public House and impact on serious and volume crime within the local community.

Police have received intelligence from a number of sources over many months of drug use and now increasingly drug dealing taking place on the premises. The number of people who have convictions for drugs use and/or supply who frequent the premises is notable. The most recent intelligence from May 2012 is increasingly focused on class A drug dealing and indicates a worsening situation in the pub which the licensee is either unwilling or unable to address.

Search warrant under the MDA 1971 is to be executed on the 25/05/12 led by Chief Inspector Alderson the Local Policing Area Commander.

Police have also secured CCTV evidence of a fight taking place in the pub on 6/9/11. The fight takes place over 20mins approximately both inside and outside the pub causing the police to be called attend. On arrival the two protagonists denied that there had been any disorder. There were no other customers in the pub and the witness outside wished to remain anonymous. The CCTV was not viewed at that time. Mr Forster however was present throughout. He failed to intervene and in fact served both males with more alcohol throughout the episode.

On 8/9/11 officers had cause to make enquiries at the pub looking for the suspect in a robbery investigation who was known to drink there. The suspect was located at the bar by the two officers and invited to speak with them outside. On being arrested the suspect offered resistance to the two female officers who requested further backup. Retrospectively, police have secured CCTV footage from inside the premises which shows the officers' struggle with the suspect in the entrance hall. It also shows apparently shows Mr Forster arrive on the premises, walk through the bar area, look through the glass into the entrance where the officers were struggling with the suspect and fail to offer them any assistance.

On 28/1/12 police took report of an assault which had occurred outside the pub the night before. The victim was a 17year old who had been in the pub with other celebrating an 18<sup>th</sup> birthday party. A confrontation took place outside between the youngster and another customer which resulted in the victim receiving a punch to the jaw. Initial enquiries were made at the pub to identify the suspect and the following record was made on the file "landlord identified <sup>xxxx</sup> as fitting description and drinking in the pub on 27/1/12, not willing to make statement". CCTV footage was seized and local officers were able to identify the suspect from that themselves removing the need to pursue a statement from Mr Forster. However his failure to provide a statement at the outset again must be noted.

The licensee has had numerous offers of advice and support from local police. He has failed to engage with the local Pubwatch scheme and allowed people banned by other licensees into his pub.

The police are of the opinion that it is in the interest of public protection that these premises are prevented from operating as a matter of urgency. The summary above clearly outlines a persistent problem of of violent incidents, and




escalating concern about drug use and supply. The police have no confidence in the Licensees ability or willingness to address these matters. With a forthcoming Bank Holidays and warmer weather likely to result in increased custom at the premises the police feel that an expedited review is necessary rather than a review under under Section 51 Licensing Act 2003.

To make an application of this nature is unusual, however the information that has been provided in support of this application describe a Public House that is seriously impacting on serious crime and serious disorder within the local community.

Detective Superintendent Paul Fullwood

25/05/2012

  
 Detective Superintendent Paul Fullwood  
 (Signed) *Johnnie Sgt Paul Fullwood*  
 (Date) *25/05/12*



Crime types Neighbourhood Streets

### Street-level crime and ASB in March 2012

Grouped by crime types. To protect privacy, individual addresses are not pinpointed on the map. Crimes are mapped to an anonymous point on or near the road where they occurred.

**All crime and ASB** 19

To show crimes of a specific type click on the links below. To view details of individual crimes click the markers on the map.

**Burglary** 4

**Anti-social behaviour** 7

**Robbery** 1

**Vehicle crime** 4

**Violent crime** 3


**Public Disorder and Weapons** 0

**Shoplifting** 0

**Criminal damage and Arson** 2

**Other Theft** 1

**Drugs** 0



Crime types  
Streets  
Neighbourhood

**Street-level crime and ASB in March 2012**  
Grouped by crime types. To protect privacy, individual addresses are not pinpointed on the map. Crimes are mapped to an anonymous point on or near the road where they occurred.

All crime and ASB **19**

To show crimes of a specific type click on the links below. To view details of individual crimes click the markers on the map.

Burglary **4**

Anti-social behaviour **7**

Robbery **1**

Vehicle crime **4**

Violent crime **0**


Public Disorder and Weapons **0**

Shoplifting **0**

Criminal damage and Arson **2**

Other Theft **1**

Drugs **0**



Network 5  
Internet access

Crime types   Streets   Neighbourhood

### Street-level crime and ASB in February 2012

Grouped by crime types. To protect privacy, individual addresses are not pinpointed on the map. Crimes are mapped to an anonymous point on or near the road where they occurred.

All crime and ASB

16

To show crimes of a specific type click on the links below. To view details of individual crimes click the markers on the map.

Burglary

3

Anti-social behaviour

9

Robbery

0

Vehicle crime

1

Violent crime

0

Public Disorder and Weapons

0

Shoplifting

1

Criminal damage and Arson


1

Other Theft

1

Drugs

0



Network 5  
Internet access



**Street-level crime and ASB in February 2012**  
 Grouped by crime types. To protect privacy, individual addresses are not pinpointed on the map. Crimes are mapped to an anonymous point on or near the road where they occurred.

**All crime and ASB** 16

To show crimes of a specific type click on the links below. To view details of individual crimes click the markers on the map.

**Burglary** 3

**Anti-social behaviour** 9

**Robbery** 0

**Vehicle crime** 1

**Violent crime** 0

**Public Disorder and Weapons** 0

**Shoplifting** 1

**Criminal damage and Arson** 0

**Other Theft** 1

**Drugs** 0




Crime types Neighbourhood Streets

**Street-level crime and ASB in January 2012**  
Grouped by crime types. To protect privacy, individual addresses are not pinpointed on the map. Crimes are mapped to an anonymous point on or near the road where they occurred.

**All crime and ASB** 20

To show crimes of a specific type click on the links below. To view details of individual crimes click the markers on the map.

Burglary	3
Anti-social behaviour	4
Robbery	0
Vehicle crime	0
Violent crime	5
Public Disorder and Weapons	0
Shoplifting	0
Criminal damage and Arson	2
Other Theft	3
Drugs	0



### Street-level crime and ASB in January 2012

Grouped by crime types. To protect privacy, individual addresses are not pinpointed on the map. Crimes are mapped to an anonymous point on or near the road where they occurred.

All crime and ASB

20

To show crimes of a specific type click on the links below. To view details of individual crimes click the markers on the map.

Burglary

3

Anti-social behaviour

4

Robbery

0

Vehicle crime

0

Violent crime

6

Public Disorder and Weapons

0

Shoplifting

0

Criminal damage and Arson

2

Other Theft

3

Drugs

0





**Street-level crime and ASB in January 2012**  
 Grouped by crime types. To protect privacy, individual addresses are not pinpointed on the map. Crimes are mapped to an anonymous point on or near the road where they occurred.

**All crime and ASB** 20

To show crimes of a specific type click on the links below. To view details of individual crimes click the markers on the map.

**Burglary** 3

**Anti-social behaviour** 4

**Robbery** 0

**Vehicle crime** 0

**Violent crime** 6

**Public Disorder and Weapons** 0

**Shoplifting** 0

**Criminal damage and Arson** 2

**Other Theft** 3

**Drugs** 0



Map data ©2012 Google - Terms of Use

Crime types Neighbourhood Streets

### Street-level crime and ASB in December 2011

Grouped by crime types. To protect privacy, individual addresses are not pinpointed on the map. Crimes are mapped to an anonymous point on or near the road where they occurred.

**All crime and ASB** 10

To show crimes of a specific type click on the links below. To view details of individual crimes click the markers on the map.

**Burglary** 1

**Anti-social behaviour** 5

**Robbery** 0

**Vehicle crime** 0

**Violent crime** 0


**Public Disorder and Weapons** 0

**Shoplifting** 0

**Criminal damage and Arson** 1

**Other Theft** 0

**Drugs** 1



### Street-level crime and ASB in December 2011

Grouped by crime types. To protect privacy, individual addresses are not pinpointed on the map. Crimes are mapped to an anonymous point on or near the road where they occurred.

All crime and ASB

10

To show crimes of a specific type click on the links below. To view details of individual crimes click the markers on the map.

Burglary

1

Anti-social behaviour

5

Robbery

0

Vehicle crime

0

Violent crime

0

Public Disorder and Weapons

0

Shoplifting

0

Criminal damage and Arson


1

Other Theft

0

Drugs

1



Map data ©2012 Google - Terms of Use



Crime types Streets Neighbourhood

### Street-level crime and ASB in November 2011

Grouped by crime types. To protect privacy, individual addresses are not pinpointed on the map. Crimes are mapped to an anonymous point on or near the road where they occurred.

**All crime and ASB** 18

To show crimes of a specific type click on the links below. To view details of individual crimes click the markers on the map.

**Burglary** 3

**Anti-social behaviour** 7

**Robbery** 0

**Vehicle crime** 1

**Violent crime** 0


**Public Disorder and Weapons** 0

**Shoplifting** 1

**Criminal damage and Arson** 0

**Other Theft** 3

**Drugs** 1



Map data ©2012 Google - Terms of Use

Network 5  
Internet access

Crime types Neighbourhood Streets

### Street-level crime and ASB in November 2011

Grouped by crime types. To protect privacy, individual addresses are not pinpointed on the map. Crimes are mapped to an anonymous point on or near the road where they occurred.

All crime and ASB **18**

To show crimes of a specific type click on the links below. To view details of individual crimes click the markers on the map.

Burglary **3**

Anti-social behaviour **7**

Robbery **0**

Vehicle crime **1**

Violent crime **0**


Public Disorder and Weapons **0**

Shoplifting **1**

Criminal damage and Arson **0**

Other Theft **3**

Drugs **1**



Map data ©2012 Google - Terms of Use

Crime types Streets Neighbourhood

**Street-level crime and ASB in October 2011**  
 Grouped by crime types. To protect privacy, individual addresses are not pinpointed on the map. Crimes are mapped to an anonymous point on or near the road where they occurred.

**All crime and ASB** 19

To show crimes of a specific type click on the links below. To view details of individual crimes click the markers on the map.

**Burglary** 1

**Anti-social behaviour** 7

**Robbery** 1

**Vehicle crime** 1

**Violent crime** 3


**Public Disorder and Weapons** 0

**Shoplifting** 0

**Criminal damage and Arson** 6

**Other Theft** 4

**Drugs** 1



Network 5  
 Internet access

23  
 Ma  
 A1301






Crime types Neighbourhood Streets

**Street-level crime and ASB in October 2011**  
 Grouped by crime types. To protect privacy, individual addresses are not pinpointed on the map. Crimes are mapped to an anonymous point on or near the road where they occurred.

**All crime and ASB** 19

To show crimes of a specific type click on the links below. To view details of individual crimes click the markers on the map.


Burglary	1
Anti-social behaviour	7
Robbery	1
Vehicle crime	1
Violent crime	3
Public Disorder and Weapons	0
Shoplifting	0
Criminal damage and Arson	0
Other Theft	4
Drugs	1



Network 5  
 Internet access



To see all the details that are visible on the screen, use the Print link next to the map.



Best restaurants advisor - [www.eatintouch.com/](http://www.eatintouch.com/) - Up-to-date. Intuitive. Reliable. Check reviews. Book online [nc Ad](#)

### Driving directions to The Longbow Pub

01223 842977

**A** The Rose  
81 London Rd  
Cambridge CB22 5DG

01223 843 349

1. Head northwest on London Rd/A1301 toward Bury Rd
2. Turn right onto Church St

410 ft

0.1 mi

**B** The Longbow Pub  
2 Church Street  
Cambridge CB22 5DS  
01223 842977

Est. fuel cost: £0.05

These directions are for planning purposes only. You may find that construction projects, traffic, weather, or other events may cause conditions to differ from the map results, and you should plan your route accordingly. You must obey all signs or notices regarding your route.

Map data ©2012 Google



**STREET LEVEL CRIME DATA – FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS / ISSUES**  
**RAISED:**

During discussions with the police in relation to the provision of street level crime data on the national Crimemapper website, a number of questions and issues have been raised. These have been given extensive consideration by the project team and national Crimemapper Strategic Steering group. Please find below a brief summary of frequently asked questions, issues raised and our response.

**1. How will the privacy of victims be maintained?**

The core role of the crime mapper site is to provide street level data to communities - a balance needs to be achieved between provision of information that is accurate and not misleading but that addresses any privacy and security concerns.

In developing the methodology for this work, careful consideration has therefore been given to relevant legislation and codes of practice, which govern requirements to maintain the privacy and confidentiality of victims and witnesses, including the Data Protection Act 1998, The Victim's Code of Practice and Victim's Charter and the UK Statistics Authority's Code of Practice for Official Statistics. There has also been extensive consultation with the Information Commissioner's Office, who are represented on the steering group.

The following factors have been considered in detail to find that balance and to determine the level of detail to be provided on Crimemapper, to comply with relevant legislation and protect privacy:

**(i) The granularity of the crime-map**

In an earlier letter to Chiefs, we set out our initial proposal to deliver the developments - profiling crime data to 'street level' and published in such a way that ensures the location of a crime can not be narrowed down to fewer than eight postal addresses – making clear that this would be tested over the coming months.

We have since conducted further testing and research to clarify at what point the street level data becomes misrepresentative whilst balancing the need to deliver street level crime information in both urban and rural areas and protecting the identity of individuals. In doing so, we have also considered in detail the recently published guidance on crime mapping by the Information Commissioner's Office.

In the light of all of this it was agreed by the steering group that increasing the threshold to 12 postal addresses (an increase of 50% on eight postal addresses) appropriately minimises the risk of identifying specific addresses whilst ensuring that street level data which is meaningful and representative may still be maintained. Threshold levels of the number of postal addresses set any higher than 12 were found to compromise the quality of the data to such an extent that it becomes



misleading due to misleading 'snap points'<sup>1</sup> and displaced crime / ASB information.

**It should be noted that the number of postal addresses i.e. 12, is an absolute *minimum* figure – a search will never profile less than this number and in the majority of cases will be significantly more.**

**(ii) The frequency of data uploads**

Due to the monthly timescales for data upload, any crime or ASB incident displayed on the site will be a minimum of 23 days old and may be up to 53 days old, significantly reducing opportunities for the identification of victims by association with other potential sources of information. One month following date of upload, the data for that month is then removed from the map and presented in the trend analysis data set.

**(iii) The sensitivity of the crime**

Crime categories were selected two years ago, as part of the first phase of the Crimemapper project and minimising impact on privacy was considered as part of this process. Guidance was issued to forces accordingly followed by a letter from the ACPD lead for Crimemapper DCC Neil Rhodes.

**(iv) The information recorded on the map**

Crimemapper will display explanatory information, ensuring that those who use the site have a clear understanding of the data and what it represents, its accuracy and restrictions on use.

**(v) Feedback and monitoring**

The site will provide a facility for the public to give feedback about Crimemapper, and there will be continued monitoring of the impact of the provision of street level data, for review and any future developments.

Additionally, a Data Sharing Agreement between the police service, the NPIA and Rock Kitchen Harris will be in place, to ensure compliance by all parties with the Data Protection Act 1998.

Collectively, each of these factors will ensure that the necessary safeguards are in place to protect privacy, confidentiality and security.

**2. Will some of the data be misleading, where crimes / ASB incidents recorded in streets with less than 12 postal addresses are located at an alternative "snap-point"?**

Careful consideration has been given to the level of granularity of crime / incident data, to ensure that the correct balance is achieved between providing sufficient detail for data to be representative and accurate, and simultaneously, protecting the privacy and confidentiality of victims. Displacement of crimes to alternative snap points will be kept to a minimum, and only occur when it is

---

<sup>1</sup> A 'snap' point is the nearest geographical reference point on a map to which a crime/ASB is assigned. It will always be on the nearest street and never intentionally be over a dwelling or premises.



necessary to protect privacy – i.e. for those streets where there are less than 12 postal addresses.

Whenever a crime / ASB incident that has been recorded in a road with less than 12 postal addresses is re-located to a snap point, this will still remain within the same Neighbourhood Policing area and force area. The Crimemapper site will provide a comprehensive explanation of the snap points, ensuring those viewing the information have a full understanding of the data, and potential radius of location of the crimes / incidents displayed.

Additionally, there is functionality within the site for forces to add further information to provide local context, as considered appropriate for any incident.

### **3. How do we illustrate crimes on Crimemapper where the location is not known (e.g. theft, where the victim can not stipulate exact location of incident)?**

These crimes must still be included in the data to be displayed on the crime map, irrespective of the fact that the location where they were committed is not known. Forces may either use the location that the crime was recorded, or alternatively may select a specific location or locations on the map to display all of these “unknown location crimes” collectively. Forces have the option to add contextual information to provide further explanation should they wish to do so.

### **4. In what format has the snap point data been provided to forces and what checks should we consider completing?**

The snap point data has been provided in a CSV (Comma Separated Values) file co-ordinates. These may be plotted by any mapping system used by your force. If you require any further guidance or technical advice please contact the project team, who will assist (contact details below).

An algorithm has been used to identify the snap points. This process has been approved by the NPfA, and ensures that snap points are not located on any roads with less than 12 postal addresses. The points will never be located directly over a property and will always be in the centre of a road. It is likely that a four arrow icon will be used to illustrate snap points, indicating “in this area” rather than “on this exact point”. It is recommended that forces conduct a cursory check (consider dip sampling) of the positioning of these points, to ensure that they are satisfied that they do not fall on any roads with less than 12 postal addresses. In the event that you have any concerns in relation to the positioning of the snap points or any other issues, please contact the project team at the earliest opportunity.

### **5. What sort of contextual information can we provide?**

Provision of contextual information is optional. If forces consider that additional information about an individual crime or ASB incident, or a number of crimes / incidents collectively may assist users of the site to have an understanding of



the data in a local context, this function is available. It is strongly recommended that every care is taken to ensure any additional information included does not contain any personal information which may compromise privacy or security, as context information will be displayed on the site 'as-is' without undergoing sanitisation.

**6. Some forces are reviewing their organisation and delivery of Neighbourhood Policing. What are the implications for Crimemapper if the Neighbourhood Policing Team boundaries change?**

If Neighbourhood Policing Team boundaries change, please notify the project team at the earliest opportunity, so that work can be progressed to make the relevant changes on the Crimemapper site. It will be necessary for you to provide details of population figures for the new NPT areas once boundaries have been determined.

**7. Will the systems for the transfer of data from forces to Rock Kitchen Harris (RKH) be secure?**

Yes. This process is detailed in the Risk Management Accreditation Document Set. The Incident Data will be delivered to RKH in accordance with the Government Protective Marking Scheme. The Data will be transferred over encrypted connections within the "Accredited System Environment". This system will be accredited by the NPJA National Accreditation Team as meeting the Information Assurance requirements as mandated by the ACPD Information Systems Community Security Policy and the Security Policy Framework.

**8. Have RKH staff received the necessary vetting for handling and processing the Data?**

Yes, this is detailed in the Risk Management Accreditation Document Set. Access to the Incident Data will be restricted to those employees of RKH who have undergone screening in accordance with the HMG Baseline Personnel Security Standard, and are approved by the NPJA.

**9. What is the process to refresh data sets when amendments are required, for example, to include new information on "no crimes"?**

In order to refresh previously uploaded data which may have changed and require amendment, this may be added to the Neighbourhood Data upload. Extra data uploads are not required.

**10. What are the safeguards to prevent information being taken from Crimemapper and being misrepresented elsewhere?**

Only data that can be seen on the website will be released via the API and nothing more. Anyone re-using the data obtained from the Crimemapper API

will be required to agree and comply with the terms and conditions, which will prohibit distortion and modification of the data and other derogatory action. Anyone in breach of these terms will have their licence key revoked. The Information Commissioner Office's recently published guidance makes clear that it is the responsibility of third parties making use of crime-maps or associated data for their own purposes to take on their own data protection responsibilities, and liabilities, to the extent that their activities involve the processing of personal data. For clarity, there is no proposal to make officer photographs available through the API at this time.

### **1.1. A variety of definitions of crime categories are used for publication of data and this lack of consistency is confusing for the public.**

There are currently a number of different methods used to aggregate crime and incident data for publication by the Home Office, the HMIC and individual forces. This issue is currently being considered at a national level by a Technical Advisory Group which is attended by representatives of the tripartite, the HMIC and the NPIA. The group is fully sighted on developments to Crimemapper, which will form part of their considerations when determining any national policy or recommended good practice for the aggregation of crime categories and publication of data. The process used to select the current crime categories used for publication of data on Crimemapper considered the needs of the end user of the information and are considered fit for purpose. They will be subject to review in response to feedback and research relating to the requirements of users of the site, in addition to any future recommendations of the Technical Advisory Group.

### **1.2. What is TeamDB? What are our responsibilities in relation to provision of updates to TeamDB?**

TeamDB is a database containing Neighbourhood Policing Team information for all forces across England and Wales. It is used to feed information relating to Neighbourhood Policing Teams onto the existing Crimemapper website, and is a point of reference for the public on anything they need to know about their local Neighbourhood Policing team or activities.

When the new version of Crimemapper is launched in January, this section of the site will become far more prominent, and will be displayed on the front page of the website. Therefore, it is even more important that the information is complete, accurate and up to date.

The information required for each NPT is as follows:

- NPT overview / description
- Details of police station or other location where the NPT is based
- Contact details
- Photographs of members of NPT (optional)
- Either a biography of each member of the team or their individual contact details
- Future meetings and events



- URLs / addresses of any twitter accounts, you tube accounts, face book pages
- RSS feeds (containing news on what is happening in forces)

In preparation for the launch of the new Crimemapper site in January, it is asked that you review the information on TeamDB for all of your NPTs, to ensure that there is nothing missing, and it is accurate and up to date. Please could you ensure that has been completed by 1<sup>st</sup> January 2011. If you would like to have a copy of the information currently on TeamDB for each of the NPTs within your force area, to assist your review, please contact the project team.

If you require any further information or clarification, please contact the project team via the Crimemapper website: [help.crimemapper.co.uk](http://help.crimemapper.co.uk)

Alternatively, please contact Amanda Diggens on 07595 010967, or [amanda.diggens@npia.pnn.police.uk](mailto:amanda.diggens@npia.pnn.police.uk)



**Crime and disorder associated with the Longbow, Stapleford**

**Not protectively marked version**

**Updated 12 June 2012**

***Contents***  
Introduction  
Offences and incidents  
Recent intelligence

## Introduction

This report was commissioned by DCI Kevin Vanterpool to give an overview of violent crime and disorder in Stapleford related to the Longbow public house.

### Summary of findings

In Stapleford generally there are low numbers of violent crime and criminal damage offences and of anti-social behaviour incidents. There were four violent crime and two criminal damage offences and eight ASB incidents over a five month period to 07/05/2012.

The Longbow pub is associated with most violent crime and criminal damage offences in the village. Although the numbers associated with the pub are low, offences and incidents are disproportionately associated with it.

Nominal A (who was arrested at the pub on 25/5/12 and charged with possession of class A drugs offences) and his associates are regularly mentioned as being linked to offences or incidents in some way.

### Methodology

The report is based on data retrieved from force systems for the five months 08/12/2011 to 07/05/2012. Violent crime and criminal damage offences from CrimeFile and anti-social behaviour incidents from C&C3 systems were extracted where the ward code was equal to 213D. All the offences and incidents within the area bounded by Mingle Lane, Gog Magog Way, Bury Road, the southern part of Haverhill Road, the dismantled railway to the south of Stapleford and the railway line to the west were then analysed. The area is illustrated in the map below.

Area of Stapleford surveyed



## **Offences and incidents**

---

As the Longbow public house in Church Lane is the focus of crime and disorder in Stapleford, an account of the offences associated with it are looked at in some detail so an assessment can be made of the impact of the pub on the village.

### **Violent crime at the Longbow**

The two following offences involve different offenders who both frequent the pub.

In late January 2012 the victim attended several pubs in Stapleford with a group of friends for his birthday. Outside the Longbow, in the late evening, the victim was smoking with several friends when he was assaulted. CCTV and witness accounts state that the offender pushed his way into this group and without provocation punched the victim on the jaw causing ligament damage and swelling. The offender also punched another of the group but less seriously. He was charged with assault occasioning actual bodily harm. The offender has dealings with Nominal A and frequents the Longbow. There is intelligence to suggest he is involved in drug dealing there. He is mentioned in connection to the first criminal damage offence below.

In the second offence, the female victim and male suspect had been in a relationship for nearly a year but had not lived together. They had an argument in the Longbow pub in January 2012. The victim then returned to the pub car park the next day to wait for a friend to pick her up in her car. The suspect saw the victim and came out of the pub to speak to her. He punched her in the chest causing her to stumble. She called the police but refused then and subsequently to name her former boyfriend or the witness friend, saying she only made the complaint in case the situation escalated. A witness who later heard of the victim's first name, identified that a woman of the same first name was a girlfriend of a male who had lived in the upstairs flat at the time. He had been evicted a week or so after the offence as he had fallen out with the landlord.

### **Violent crime not associated with the Longbow**

There were two other violent crime offences during the period. One was a threat to kill from an estranged partner who was being denied access to his children by their mother. The second was a teenager who roughly grabbed his sister.



**Criminal damage associated with the Longbow**

There were only two offences of criminal damage in Stapleford over the period, both in the vicinity of the Longbow and both of which appear to be related to Nominal A.

The landlord of the Longbow reported that in December 2011, four men (two of whom are on Sawston pubwatch's banned list) had turned up looking for Nominal A in relation to a debt of some kind. As Nominal A was not there they decided to speak to someone in the Longbow who had dealings with Nominal A, in order to establish Nominal A's whereabouts. This individual refused to reveal his whereabouts and there was a minor disturbance in the pub. The landlord tried to intervene but was punched in the face by one of the group. As the men left the pub they smashed the female toilet window. The landlord stated he was reporting the crime as, if he fails to report crimes and incidents, this will have a detrimental effect on his licence and his contract with the brewery. Witnesses were too afraid to give statements.

The Longbow landlord banned Nominal A from the pub the evening of the offence. After he left the pub Nominal A was seen heading towards the landlord's home address, just up the street. A witness reported to him a short time later to say that a patio door glass had been smashed. Although Nominal A was not witnessed smashing the glass he is strongly suspected of being involved – four witnesses told the landlord that they saw Nominal A walk back up the drive but they were not prepared to give statements.

**ASB associated with the Longbow**

Three ASB incidents are connected to the Longbow. Two of these are related to noise, to music being excessively loud on a regular basis and to shouting outside the pub, which also happens often.

The third incident involves a woman who had been seriously assaulted a couple of days previously but who didn't report it. After the attack she went to the pub to tell someone she knew there what had happened. Nominal A heard of the attack on her. He then insulted her, calling her a 'fruit loop and whore' and saying 'you said you got raped, if you got raped you would have reported it'. He also said the victim was 'dead'. Nominal A then left the pub.

**ASB not associated with the Longbow**

The remaining five ASB incidents over the period involved malicious or nuisance calls (three incidents) and two incidents of loud music from a house on Church Lane which were rung in within a few hours of each other by a single informant.

**Recent intelligence  
(up to end May 2012)**

Recent intelligence suggests that there continues to be crime and disorder in Stapleford associated with the Longbow and Nominal A and his associates. The intelligence, although mainly of a relatively low grading indicates that there are likely to be unreported incidents and offences that impact on the Stapleford area.

**Nominal A  
and cocaine dealing**

Nominal A is said to be using the Longbow to deal cocaine. He has allegedly made it clear that he is running the pub and if he wants to deal then he will and there is nothing the landlord can do about it. He has also told others that have dealt in the pub that they can continue but only when he is not about or dry.

Another two named males deal cocaine at the Longbow. They only deal when Nominal A is not attending the pub to deal.

Intelligence suggests that the landlord of the Longbow was aware that a tenant of his who lived above the pub used cocaine and cannabis with friends on a daily basis.

**Fights**

There were two fights in the rear garden and car park of the Longbow over the Easter weekend involving locals and regulars. At one the landlord was present but did nothing to stop the fight.

HISTON

Fax: [REDACTED]

29 May 2012 16:41

P. 14/14

Unfiled Message

Charles Nightingale

Sent: 26 May 2012 13:59

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: Charles Nightingale

Importance: High

Longbow Public House Stapleford

I fully support the action taken last evening 25th May at The Longbow PH, This has been a long time in the planning.

I support this because I have had so many complaints about dug dealing in the Longbow going back a number of years, All of which I have reported, I hope and will support the police and South Cambridge District Council Licensing Officers in any proposed refusal to grant the present landlord a licence to reopen.

Many local residents have been uncomfortable about using this Public House for some time

  
26.5.12  
Cllr Charles Nightingale

District Councillor for the Shelford

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]



---

**Chris Savage**

---

**From:** Iain Perry  
**Sent:** 28 May 2012 16:22  
**To:** Chris Savage  
**Subject:** FW: The Longbow Public House, Stapleford

Email from Mr Peppereall

PC 1118 Iain Perry  
Sawston Safer Neighbourhood Officer  
Sawston Police Station  
Cambridge Road  
Sawston  
CB22 3DG

Tel 101  
Mobile [REDACTED]

---

**From:** D Peppereall [mailto:[REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** 28 May 2012 00:14  
**To:** Iain Perry  
**Subject:** The Longbow Public House, Stapleford

Stapleford is served by three public houses, namely the Rose in London Road, the Tree in Bar Lane and the Longbow in Church Street.

The Rose has traditionally attracted custom primarily as an eating establishment whilst the Tree has had a loyal following from the village sports clubs and local residents, offering light snacks in addition to drinks. Living in the village since 1965, I cannot recall any complaint being lodged about the mismanagement of these premises. Indeed, they are an asset to the village and actively enhance the spirit of a village community.

The Longbow, formerly called the Three Horseshoes, has had the most changes in landlords in recent years and could be a reason for being the least supported of the three, in as much that the loyal base from the Stapleford residents has been constantly weakened.

During the last 12 months, it has become apparent the Longbow has allegedly become a 'haven' for members of the wider community i.e Sawston and Great Shelford, where their presence in their local public houses has not been wanted. Nearby residents have expressed their concern about the behavioural habits of those sitting outside with foul language and noise late into the night, being cited. The visual frontage of the Longbow has gained an unkempt appearance mainly due to the discarding of smoking byproducts, causing adverse comment. The recently restored old Slaughter House building adjacent to the Longbow has attracted rising incidents of urination within the front porchway. The Parish Council has become increasingly concerned about the increase in breakins to cars in the Church Street vicinity as well as burglary entries to domestic properties in the locality. Local gossip would suggest that there may be a connection here with the financing of drugs. The presence of needles found in the public grassed area adjacent to the Longbow would tend to support this theory.

Whilst the economic downturn must be giving concern to the financial viability of many of our public houses, it nevertheless remains the responsibility of individual landlords to continue to fully operate within the law, whilst being an asset and bringing harmony to the community with their ongoing activity.

David Peppereall

**RESTRICTED (when complete)**

**WITNESS STATEMENT**

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B: Criminal Procedure Rules 2005, Rule 27.1

URN

Statement of: PC 1118 Iain Perry

Age if under 18: O'18 (if over 18 insert 'over 18') Occupation: Police Constable

This statement (consisting of \_\_\_\_\_ 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 willfully stated in it, anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Tick if witness evidence is visually recorded  (supply witness details on rear)

I am Police Constable 1118 Iain Perry currently attached to Sawston Police Station in the role of Safer Neighbourhood Officer/Complex problem solver. I have been at Sawston since 2002 and have held this post since January 2003. My role has seen me take local ownership of problems in the Sawston area. As my role has dictated I have taken a very active role in tackling incidents of anti-social behaviour and drug related incidents and associated disorder. These incidents have always been highlighted to me by concerned members of the community or Parish and District Councillors on behalf of the local residents. In each and every case I have taken time to do in depth research into the problems which have been affecting the quality of life to those affected, be it ASB in or around the green open spaces or that which has centred around the local licensing economy which have included alcohol related and drug related crime. Such has been my position within the community and the trust I have built up, I have been able to gather a vast amount of community intelligence to combat such problems at the root cause. In my role I have previously addressed a variety of problems associated with licensed premises, using a variety of approaches. In 2010 myself and PC Howe began to receive complaints surrounding The Longbow public house and its customers. PC Howe made contact with the landlord, Mr Forster and visited him with a South Cambridgeshire District Council Licensing Officer. I was made aware by PC Howe that he and the licensing officer had offered to help Mr Forster to deal with his problems. At point was I made aware of Mr Forster contacting PC Howe. In 2011 PC Mutch took over from PC Howe as local officer. Her first dealings with the landlord of The Longbow, Graham Forster, was to make contact with him and offer any help the police could provide in relation to his pub and his customers. I know that she had informed him that the pub had been highlighted for disorder and drug misuse and that the police would help him in any way possible so as to protect his pub and his livelihood. He informed her that he had good CCTV and was now a

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Signature witnessed by: \_\_\_\_\_



Continuation of statement of member of the Sawston area Pubwatch Although Mr Forster made this declaration and expressed an interest to work with the police neither myself nor PC Mutch had any contact with him regarding any issues surrounding his pub. In June 2011 I was contacted by PC Sinclair, a Licensing Officer, who informed me and PC Mutch that Mr Forster and The Longbow had been effectively removed from Pubwatch as Mr Forster had knowingly allowed banned persons to use the pub. During the period of August 2010 to August 2011 both myself and PC Mutch were made aware of unreported incidents that had taken place within the rear garden and car park of the pub and in some cases the pub itself which included fights, assaults, drug taking and drug dealing. At no time did Mr Forster make contact with PC Mutch to ask for help. In July 2011 I was approached by a local resident who wished to pass on information about the pub, staff, customers and the landlord Graham Forster. The information related to unreported fights while the landlord was present and open and blatant drug misuse and dealing in the pub. In one incident a large fight took place in the pub involving 15-20 persons which spilled out into the car park. As a result no police were called and the landlord wiped the CCTV should police attend investigating the incident. The local resident also was concerned that they had witnessed open drug dealing and use in the rear garden area of the pub. In August 2011 I assumed overall responsibility for Great Shelford side of the neighbourhood which included Stapleford and the Longbow. No sooner had PC Mutch left and had I taken over from her I received the first complaints of noise from a local resident who was being directly affected by it. The noise consisted of loud music and screaming and shouting coming from the beer garden which included foul language. Shortly after this I was contacted by the licensing officer for South Cambridgeshire District Council who had also had the same complaints. She advised me that it was her intention to visit the pub and discuss with Mr Forster the concerns that had been raised by local residents within the Stapleford community. Due to an incident in Great Shelford I was asked to view CCTV from The Longbow, to possibly identify an offender, which the investigating officer had visited the pub and seized. I was tasked to view the CCTV. While I viewed the CCTV I noticed that during one period two males who were clearly drunk were fighting in the bar area and pushing each other about. Their actions caused the bar stools to be knocked over and drink to be spilt. Throughout this incident Mr Forster was present in the bar, he made no attempt to stop the fight or intervene and remove both males from the pub. In fact all he did was pick the stools up and replace them close to the bar and mop the spilt drink up. Another incident which I

41

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Signature witnessed by: \_\_\_\_\_

PTO



Continuation of statement of  
viewed was when a call was made about two males fighting in the pub which had spilled out onto Church Street. When police arrived the fight had stopped but both males had gone into the pub. Both males were taken outside by police. One of the males was the suspect for the robbery and he was identified by the attending officers. As they attempted to arrest the male he began to fight with the two female officers in the doorway. The CCTV clearly caught this struggle and also the concern that the bar maid had as she was pacing the bar area with two phones and paying a close attention to the struggle which was taking place in the doorway. The CCTV then captures Mr Forster walking outside to the front of his pub and then in the bar area looking at what was going on in his pub. At no point did he as the landlord and licensee make any attempt to assist the two officers and when spoken to about what had happened stated he was not present during the incident. The person, Sean Peters, involved in the scuffle was not even banned by Mr Forster for his actions in the pub. The CCTV also caught other minor scuffles in the pub and also regulars helping themselves to his stock without pay for them even when he was present. He never once on CCTV challenged them. On another occasion the CCTV caught two male customers going into the toilet together followed by Mr Forster. He stopped in the doorway and appeared to be speaking with both males. This action appeared strange and the two males then left the toilet and went outside. Neither male was in the toilet long enough to use it as you would normally and it is my belief that this was an indication that drug misuse had taken place and in clear view of the landlord, who appeared not to have challenged them about it or contacted police about drug misuse in his pub.

I also witnessed a Volkswagen Golf enter the car park and park close to the rear doors of the pub. The driver went into the pub and came out with a regular who I could identify approached the vehicle and got in. The footage captures an exchange of cash in return for a small white wrap. It was clear in my opinion that some form of deal had taken place in full view of the CCTV cameras at the rear of the property.

I was then made aware of an incident involving 10 males, one with a hammer fighting at the location and causing damage. I was the allocated the crime and carried out the investigation. I spoke with Mr Forster about this and he didn't seem too bothered by it and was in his words reporting it to go through the motions. He also informed me that the incident was witnessed by his customers but none of them would be prepared to provide a statement. I asked about the CCTV and he stated that he had none even through his hard drive had been returned to him.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Signature witnessed by: \_\_\_\_\_

PTO

42



Continuation of statement of

After this incident I was continually being passed information from numerous local residents who had become worried and concerned about what was going on at the pub both drug related and violence related. Such were their concerns that the residents asked that their identity was not disclosed as they were in fear of any reprisals should their names and addresses get out to those concerned. In light of these growing concerns, Insp Savage and I attended the Longbow to speak with Mr Forster and express a need for him to engage with the police so as to deal with the associated disorder that had been brought to our attention. He stated that he was aware of problems and that he did not tolerate disorder in his pub and that he had his own ban list which he operated. He was asked how many he had banned and he stated none. It was put to him that he had let persons on the Pubwatch banned list in and he defended his decision as they were warned prior to being allowed in about their behaviour. Mr Forster was asked why as a member of Pubwatch he was allowing those banned in and he stated he was no longer a member as he had left the scheme as he didn't like the way it was being run. He stated it was only recent that he had left and made no reference he had been removed by the other members from the scheme in June 2011. He was told to make contact with myself if he needed any advice or assistance but to date I have never had any contact with Mr Forster which has been of his instigation. At the time of the visit I asked Mr Forster if he ever reviewed the CCTV regardless of any incidents. He stated he did not and would only if he had what he thought was an incident or if approached by police. We concluded our visit but reminded Mr Forster of the need to keep in touch.

In March 2012 I was then allocated a crime which had been committed at the house Mr Forster lives in which is a very short distance from the pub. It was alleged that one of his regulars who had started using the pub had committed the damage after he had been barred. Mr Forster stated that he had barred him because he was beginning to throw his weight around in the pub and upsetting other regulars. He stated he had not seen this male cause the damage but four other regulars did see the male leaving the property but did not want to provide a statement. Mr Forster was informed the crime would be filed and again reminded that he would be best if he had any problems to contact police. Again since this date I have not had any calls instigated by him. However I was contacted by a male who stated that the banning of the male and the damage caused was a set up as police appeared to be taking extra interest in the pub due to this banned male using it. Since then I have been advised that the male has since been allowed back into the pub

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Signature witnessed by: \_\_\_\_\_

PTO

43



Continuation of statement of  
and that on a regular basis drugs are being used and dealt within the pub.

Since 1<sup>st</sup> May 2010 there have been 12 reported incidents directly linked to The Longbow pub. These have included 7 reports of violence were persons have been reported fighting 1 theft of a motor vehicle from the pub car park, 1 report of a drunk male flashing to passersby from the pub, 1 report of disorder were staff reported drunk males refusing to leave, 1 Rowdy/Nuisance were a customer was abused in the pub by another customer and 1 report of a wanted male seen in the pub. In December 2011 an incident was reported by the Mr Forster regarding damage caused to his property by a male he claimed he had banned from the pub. In addition and connected with the above incidents there have been 10 reported crimes during the same period. These have included 1 theft of motor vehicle (cross referenced by reported incident), 2 reports of assault (cross referenced by reported incidents), 1 report of criminal damage (cross referenced to an reported incident of violence) and as a result of the warrant on the 25<sup>th</sup> May 2012 , 6 reports of possession of drugs. There has also been a report of assault which took place in the car park of the pub but the report was taken at an address close by.

Since 2010 there have been 70 items of intelligence submitted concerning the Longbow. The vast majority of this intelligence has centred a round the use and dealing of controlled drugs, namely cocaine and cannabis. During this period a number of names had been passed which have included those that were arrested on the 25<sup>th</sup> May 2012 when a warrant was executed at the pub. These persons, [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] all have intelligence in their own right suggesting that they are very much into the supply and use of drugs, namely cocaine. In addition to the intelligence of those arrested, they also have previous convictions for either drug supply or drug possession. Other intelligence also indicated that the pub was the place to go if you wanted to buy stolen items which had come from either cars or houses in the area. At the time of this intelligence the surrounding area was subject to a higher than normal crime rate. Intelligence also came in regarding a local taxi firm who had introduced a policy whereby they would not take or collect fares to the Longbow as the drivers on occasions did not get paid and that some of the customers were under the influence of drugs and the company felt this put their drivers at risk. There was also intelligence that suggested fights had taken place in the and in the rear garden and carpark which went unreported by Mr Forster and that he had been wiping the CCTV in case police ended up investigating any third hand reports.

44

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Signature witnessed by: \_\_\_\_\_

PTO



Continuation of statement of

As I have previously stated during the period I have had direct involvement with The Longbow, a number of local residents from different locations close to the pub have contacted me to express their concerns about the pub. In some instances those that have approached me have been regulars to the pub who have witnessed at first hand what has been taking place within the in the rear garden and car park areas and have been worried about the wider problems these have had in the community. All the while, however, such was their concerns and fears they pleaded that their identities remained only known to myself as they did not want any reprisals for them or their families. It was very clear that these persons were very scared and afraid of some of the pub's regulars who were well known in the area for violence towards others and their property.

In conclusion I have concerns at the way this public house has been run by Mr Forster. It is very clear that he has had no direct control over what has been taking place in his pub and has openly allowed the illegal taking of drugs and has turned a blind eye to the dealing of drugs in his pub. In relation to public order offences and those against the person, he again has failed to act in a robust manner in dealing with these situations. He has rarely called police and a majority of the incidents have all gone unreported. When police have turned up at the pub it's in the main due to passers by reporting fights etc which have spilled out into the street. When he has called police he has never been overly helpful and it was believed he was just going through the motions so he could be seen to be reporting incidents to police. Mr Forster also claimed to operate his own banning list. One such person who he banned and then was believed to have caused damage to his property were he lived was arrested for possession of cocaine in his pub at the time of the warrant. The true extent of what has been allowed to take place over the previous two years has had a detrimental effect on the lives of those who live close by and in adjoining streets. In some cases residents have moved away to avoid being subjected to the anti-social behaviour and intimidation by those who have used the pub. It has affected the family life of those, some with children with the noise from music which has gone on until the early hours of the morning, even after it has been highlighted by council officials. I'm also concerned with the current Chief, who is also a DPS. Having made back ground checks on this male, [REDACTED], it would appear he too has been linked to drug supply and drug misuse when he has been at previous pubs. It would also appear that during the

45

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Signature witnessed by: \_\_\_\_\_

PTO

**RESTRICTED (when complete)**

MG 11(T) (Cont)

Page no. 7

Continuation of statement of  
time he has held his DPS, he has been found guilty of offences which he should have  
disclosed to the licensing officers at South Cambridgeshire District Council.

46

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Signature witnessed by: \_\_\_\_\_

PTO



**RESTRICTED (when complete)**

**WITNESS STATEMENT**

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; Criminal Procedure Rules 2005, Rule 27.1

URN

Statement of: Daniel Joseph SMITH

Age if under 18: Over (if over 18 insert 'over 18') Occupation: Police Officer

This statement (consisting of 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 in it, anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Signature: Date: 14<sup>th</sup> June 2012

Tick if witness evidence is visually recorded  (supply witness details on rear)

On 28<sup>th</sup> January 2012 I was on duty in full uniform working under the call sign sierra 44. At approximately 0900hrs I attended Addenbrookes Hospital to speak to a male who possibly had a broken jaw from the night before.

When I arrived at the Hospital I was met by a male called [REDACTED] and he's son [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told me that [REDACTED] had been discharged from hospital with ligament damage to he's jaw and they were on their way home.

When I arrived at the home address I could see the whole family was very concerned for [REDACTED] welfare. [REDACTED] was a very small slim male who told me he has been assaulted at The Longbow Public House in Stapleford.

I then sat down with [REDACTED] and took a detailed statement from him. I could clearly see [REDACTED] was in pain and was very worried about the people involved and any reprisals which may take place. During the statement [REDACTED] told me how he was punched to the jaw causing he him to fall backwards. [REDACTED] went on to describe the offender and how he was taken to hospital with a possible broken jaw.

After I finished taking the statement I attended The Longbow Public House in Stapleford.

Upon arrival I was met by a male who presented himself as the Landlord, this male was Graham FOSTER. As I stood in the bar area and spoke to FOSTER a female was also present, I did not get her details but believe this was possibly FOSTER'S partner as she

Signature: Signature witnessed by:

47



Continuation of statement of

was also stood behind the bar with him.

I explained to FOSTER that I was at the Public House following a fight the previous night where a young lad had been injured. Straight away FOSTER said he knew of no problems. I then went on to ask FOSTER if a large group of young people had been in the Pub who were not usually regulars. FOSTER said that a group had been in to the Pub and he had ID'd them all.

I then told FOSTER that a 17 year old male had been assaulted directly outside the front of the pub and the offender had possibly assaulted another person. I then passed the description of the offender and asked FOSTER if he knew this person.

FOSTER said there was only a couple of regulars present at the time and named a male called [REDACTED]. I then asked FOSTER if he would be willing to make a statement that [REDACTED] was in the pub during the night in question. FOSTER said that he would not provide a statement because he did not see anything, and did not want to get [REDACTED] in trouble if he was not responsible.

During my conversation with FOSTER he was not very helpful and I believe the female who was present was influencing him. It was explained at the time that this was a very serious matter but FOSTER did not seem very interested.

From visiting the Public House I also became aware that the offence location was probably only 10 or 12 feet away. This was in direct view of the bar and would have been very hard to miss.

Signature

.....

Signature witnessed by:

.....

48

PTO

**RESTRICTED (when complete)**

**WITNESS STATEMENT**

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; Criminal Procedure Rules 2005, Rule 27.1

URN

Statement of: Nicholas James Skipworth

Age if under 18: 018 (if over 18 insert over 18) Occupation: Police officer

This statement (consisting of 1 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 in it, anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 25/05/12

Tick if witness evidence is visually recorded  (supply witness details on rear)

I am Ds 770 Skipworth of Cambs police currently based at Parkside police station in Cambridge. I am currently a DS in Intelligence. I am a trained in licence police search advisor, I have also run several drug and covert police teams over the past 5 years. I have been trained by the forensic science service in the identification of controlled drugs.

On Friday the 25<sup>th</sup> of May 2012 I was on duty in plain casual clothes deployed as part of a team executing a drugs warrant on the Longbow pub in Stapleford.

During the warrant I observed numerous items of discarded packaging which led me to form the opinion that cocaine was being used within the pub. Some of these items I pointed out to Pc Ware who was the dedicated evidence gather for the operation.

I also swabbed several surfaces with a cozart drug testing kit. I swabbed the window sill in the men's toilet, this tested positive for cocaine, which indicates to me that the surface is used for snorting cocaine. Within the private toilet cubical in the men's toilet I also swabbed the window sill, this too tested positive for cocaine. I later swabbed a desk area in the a small bed area on the first floor of the pub I could see white powder on this surface clearly, this tested positive again for cocaine. I commented about this area to Pc Ware who was filming this area. In my opinion this appeared as a dedicated cocaine snorting area.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Signature witnessed by: \_\_\_\_\_  
49  
MG11(7) 11/10



**RESTRICTED (when complete)**

**WITNESS STATEMENT**

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; Criminal Procedure Rules 2005, Rule 27.1

URN


--	--	--	--	--

Statement of: Darren Lee Alderson

Age if under 18: Over 18 (if over 18 insert over 18) Occupation: Police Officer

This statement (consisting of 1 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 in it, anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Signature:



Date: 25/5/12

Tick if witness evidence is visually recorded  (supply witness details on rear)

I am Chief Inspector in Cambridgeshire Constabulary, posted as Area Commander for South Cambridgeshire. Today at 19:00 hours I attended, in uniform, The Longbow Public House, Church Street, Stapleford in relation to the execution of a warrant under the Misuse of Drugs Act at the premises.

At 20:08 I served Mr Graeme FORSTER with a Closure Order under Section 116 of the Licensing Act 2003, in relation to the premises as I had reasonable grounds to suspect that likely immediate to be disorder on, or in the vicinity of the premise and that in my professional opinion closure of the premises was necessary in the interests of public safety.

As part of the procedure I directed FORSTER's attention to the detailed particulars of the notice, he signed the document and accepted a copy.



Signature



Signature witnessed by:

50

**RESTRICTED (when complete)**

**WITNESS STATEMENT**

(CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B: Criminal Procedure Rules 2005, Rule 27.1

URN

--	--	--	--

Statement of: Stephen Philip KERRIDGE

Age if under 18: \_\_\_\_\_

Over 18

Occupation:

Police Inspector – Strategic Lead for Licensing, Cambridgeshire

This statement (consisting of \_\_\_\_\_ 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 in it, anything which I know to be false or do not believe to be true.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 18<sup>th</sup> May 2012

Tick if witness evidence is visually recorded

(supply witness details on rear)

I am the above named officer and the Cambridgeshire Constabulary Strategic Lead for Licensing.

In this role it is my responsibility to define and implement a Force Licensing Strategy in keeping with the Government Alcohol Strategy -which has been recently revised- and in pursuit of the four licensing objectives namely: The prevention of crime & disorder and public nuisance, the promotion of public safety and the protection of children from harm.

The twin primary goals of the Cambridgeshire Licensing Strategy for 2012/13 are :

- o To contribute to a *reduction* in alcohol-related crime and disorder in Cambridgeshire
- o To *ascertain* the *fear* of alcohol-related crime and disorder in Cambridgeshire

The Strategic Aims for Cambridgeshire in terms of Licensing in 2012/13 are:

- o The effective and transparent assessment of threat, harm and risk in and around licensed premises through a system uniform across the County
- o Open and honest engagement of licensees, to support and guide them in managing safe and attractive licensed establishments

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Signature witnessed by: \_\_\_\_\_

51



Continuation of statement of

- The promotion of the social responsibilities of licensees and dissemination of good licensing practice
- To challenge bad management, failure to identify and/or ineffective responses to threat and risks to premises' clientele and the wider community
- Be active in local licensing proceedings ensuring the commitments and opportunities as a designed Responsible Authority are undertaken in the interests of promoting the licensing objectives
- To make best use of legislation, be reflective in terms of practice, share success locally and understand and incorporate national best practice where appropriate
- To identify groups and individuals using licensed premises whose behaviour creates risks to others and take effective actions to mitigate or remove those risks.
- To identify and understand public perceptions of alcohol-related crime and disorder in and around licensed premises and where necessary tackle the perception gap

The main thrust of work in pursuit of these strategic aims has been the development and use of a risk assessment tool known as the **Licensing Traffic Light System (TLS)**. The TLS is a means of assessing threat, risk and harm in and around licensed premises, to inform action in the interests of making premises safer and more pleasant to use. Sometimes referred to as the "Cardiff Model", where the approach was developed and operated successfully, TLS has become a popular and effective way of addressing risk, which is utilised around the country.

In simple terms, data is collected from a number of sources concerning incidents, crimes, events and information relating to licensed premises and manually entered into a pre-determined risk matrix. A numerical risk rating for each premise is then generated by the matrix on monthly basis to compare levels of

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Signature witnessed by: \_\_\_\_\_

PTO

52

Continuation of statement of

risks at different licensed premises. The higher the score, the greater the risk presented.

The numerical ratings sit within "bands", resulting in each premises being labelled as "Red", "Amber" or "Green". Premises in each band require different levels of intervention by the Local Policing Team and Partners with responsibilities for the licensing objectives.

- Green Status = There are currently no concerns regarding the management of the premises or threat, harm and risk to those using them.
- *Amber Status* = There are some concerns regarding the effective management of the premises and/or some concerns regarding threat, harm and risk to those using them. The premises are to be monitored and the licensee engaged and informed.
- Red Status = There are concerns regarding the effective management of the premises and/or concerns regarding threat, harm and risk. This requiring formal engagement of the licensee in the interests of those using the premises and immediate action.

In keeping with national practice, and for fairness, the threshold for "red, amber and green" status differs dependent on the capacity of the premises: There is a greater tolerance for incidents in larger premises serving larger bodies of customers, compared to small, very local venues.

Licensed premises can also positively impact on their rating through the completion of positive interventions in and around their premises, both independently and in support of police action.

53

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Signature witnessed by: \_\_\_\_\_

PTO



Continuation of statement of

During a process of "base-lining" data in March 2012 ahead of the start of a new performance year in April, **The Longbow Public House, Stapleford** was identified as one of two licensed premises in the South Cambridgeshire area whose TLS assessment was amber. This was based on a rolling six month assessment of all data collected regarding the operation of the premises.

The premises were rated at **amber**, scoring 22, making it the highest scoring small capacity licensed premises in the County and the highest scoring premises of any size in South Cambridgeshire. During the base-lining process it was noted that whilst recorded crime and incidents were taking place at the premises, a significant quantity of the information fed into the risk assessment related to information and police observations concerning the management of the licence contrary to the principles of the licensing objectives, creating risk for those using the premises.

Following the identification of any premises as amber or red, my instruction to local policing teams as the Force Strategic Lead for Licensing and ultimate manager of the TLS is that effective intervention must be sought in the interests of promoting the licensing objectives and reducing risk.

Since the completion of the baseline assessment I have been made aware of continuing concerns raised with regard to the management of The Longbow Public House, Stapleford by the Local Policing Command.

I submit this statement for the consideration of the South Cambridgeshire District Council Licensing Committee or other appropriate hearing with regard to the review of the alcohol licence granted to The Longbow Public House, Stapleford.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Signature witnessed by: \_\_\_\_\_

54

PTO

RESTRICTED (when complete)

MG11

WITNESS STATEMENT

CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; Criminal Procedure Rules 2005, Rule 27.1

URN [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Statement of: [REDACTED],  
Age if under 18: OVER 18 (If over 18 insert over 18) Occupation: [REDACTED]

This statement (consisting of [ ] 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 willfully stated in it anything which I know to be false, or do not believe to be true.

Signature: [REDACTED] Date: 27/5/12

Tick if witness evidence is visually recorded  (supply witness details on rear)

I AM THE ABOVE NAMED PERSON AND I RESIDE AT THE ADDRESS ABOVE. I HAVE BEEN ASKED TO GIVE A STATEMENT REGARDING THE LONGBOW PUBIC HOUSE NUMBER 2 CHURCH STREET, STAPLEFORD. I HAVE LIVED AT MY ADDRESS FOR 26 YEARS LAST JANUARY. MY PARENT IS [REDACTED] TO THE LONGBOW. OVER THE LAST YEAR, I HAVE HAD SOME CONCERNS REGARDING THE MANAGEMENT OF THE PUB. OVER THIS TIME PERIOD THINGS HAVE GOT PROGRESSIVELY WORSE. IT HAS GOT TO THE POINT WHERE I CAN NO LONGER HAVE PEOPLE IN THE GARDEN OR TO PEOPLE SHOUTING, AND USING FOUL LANGUAGE. THERE WERE FIGHTS ON A REGULAR BASIS ONE NIGHT I CAN RECALL APPROXIMATELY FOUR OR FIVE WEEKS AGO, THERE WERE THREE MORE THESE PEOPLE FIGHTING OUT SIDE THE PUB, ONE WOMAN AND TWO MENS. THE LANDLORD WALKED PAST THE FIGHT, TO HIS HOUSE OVER THE ROAD, I DON'T KNOW WHAT WAS HAPPENING. MUSIC WAS OFFEN UNTIL LATE IN THE EVENING

Signature: [REDACTED] Signature witnessed by: [REDACTED]



RESTRICTED (when complete)

M011(GCNT)

Page No. 2 of 2

Continuation of Statement of: [REDACTED]

UNTIL 12:30AM THE BASE COMING FROM THE  
SPEAKERS WAS UNBEARABLE. I FELT THAT THERE  
WAS (BRED) NO CONSIDERATION FOR LOCAL RESIDENTS  
AT ALL. I HAVE FEEL THAT I COULD NOT  
COMPLAIN TO THE LANDLORD DUE TO FEAR OF  
AND COME BACK.

THE WEEKENDS PARTICULARLY FRIDAY AND SATURDAY,  
THINGS ARE NOW WORSE. I FEEL INTIMIDATED  
TO WALK PAST THE PORE IN THE EVENINGS,  
DUE TO THE PEOPLE OUTSIDE. I HAVE RECENTLY  
CONSIDERED POSTING MY HOUSE ON THE MARKET  
AS I CANNOT STAND THIS ANY LONGER.

Signature: [REDACTED]

Signature witnessed by: [REDACTED]

[Handwritten signature]



RESTRICTED (When complete)

MG11

WITNESS STATEMENT

CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; Criminal Procedure Rules 2005, Rule 27.1

URN [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Statement of: [REDACTED]

Age If under 18: OUELIS (If over 18 insert over 18) Occupation: [REDACTED]

This statement (consisting of 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 in it, anything which I know to be false, or do not believe to be true.

Signature: [REDACTED] Date: 27/05/12.

Tick if witness evidence is visually recorded  (supply witness details on rear)

I AM THE ABOVE NAMED PERSON AND RESIDE AT THE ADDRESS ABOVE. I HAVE BEEN ASKED TO GIVE A STATEMENT REGARDING THE LONGBAR PUBLIC HOUSE, NUMBER 2 CHURCH STREET, STAFFORD. I PLAINTIFF WANT THIS REPORT AND HAVE BEEN LOOKING FOR APPROXIMATELY 18 MONTHS. I HAVE HAD SOME SERIOUS CONCERNS OVER THE MANAGEMENT OF THE PUB, DURING THE LAST 12 MONTHS. I REALISED THAT SOMETHING WAS WRONG. ON A WEEKLY BASIS THERE WERE ISSUES WITH FIGHTS, EXCESSIVE NOISE, OBSCENE SINGERS & SWARMS AT ONE POINT I HAD SEXUAL COMMENTS AIMED TOWARDS MYSELF, AND I FEEL PARTICULARLY INTIMIDATED, ESPECIALLY AS ON SOME OCCASIONS I HAD MY CHILDREN WITH ME AT THE TIME. THERE HAVE BEEN PROBLEMS WITH GLASS BOTTLES BEING THROWN AT THE WALL OUTSIDE TRAVIS & PERKINS, SMASHING GLASS ALL OVER THE PAVEMENT. PEOPLE WOULD ALSO RUN DOWN THE ROAD THROWING BOTTLES AT EACH OTHER. I CAN ALSO REPORT THAT CANDOMS WERE OFTEN

Signature: [REDACTED] Signature witnessed by: [REDACTED]



RESTRICTED (when complete)

MGT1(GOVT)

Page No. 2 of 2

Continuation of Statement of: 

FOUND LITTERED OUTSIDE THE PUBS.  
THE NOISE FROM THE PUBS IS CONSTANT, AND  
INCREASES IN VOLUME, WHEN THE WARMER IS  
GOOD AND THE PUB BECOMES QUIET. PEOPLE USE  
THE PUB DO NOT THINK THEY SHOULD SHOUT ALL THE  
TIME. MUSIC CAN BE HEARD FROM THE PUB  
UNTIL SOME MIDNIGHT. THE BASS FROM THE  
SPEAKERS VIBRATES THE WHOLE TIME.  
I HAVE APPROACHED THE LANDLORD ON SEVERAL  
OCCASIONS REGARDING THE ISSUES, BUT HE BECAME  
VERY AGGRESSIVE, AND DISMISSED. I WAS MADE  
TO FEEL VERY INTIMIDATED.  
THE SITUATION HAS GOT SO BAD, THAT WE  
HAVE DECIDED TO MOVE AND RENT A PROPERTY  
SOMEWHERE ELSE.  
I LOVE NEXT DOOR TO THE LANDLORD, WHICH  
IN ITSELF CAUSED PROBLEMS, AND WAS MADE  
THINGS VERY AWKWARD.  
SINCE THE PUB WAS CLOSED ON ERMAY 25TH  
MAY 2012, WE HAVE NOTICED THAT PEOPLE THAT  
WOULD NORMALLY USE THE PUB, HAVE BEEN USING  
THE LANDLORDS GARDEN INSTEAD. THERE WAS A  
LOT OF SHOUTING, AND LOUD MUSIC BEING  
PLAYED.  
I AM FULLY SUPPORTIVE OF ANY PUNISH ACTION  
REGARDING THE LANDLORD PUBLISHING MUSIC.

Signature: Signature witnessed by: 



RESTRICTED (When complete)

MC11

WITNESS STATEMENT

CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (e) and 5B; Criminal Procedure Rules 2005, Rule 27.1

Statement of: [Redacted] URN [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Age if under 18: 0/18 (if over 18 insert over 18) Occupation: [Redacted]

This statement (consisting of 2 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 in it, anything which I know to be false, or do not believe to be true.

Signature: [Redacted] Date: 28/5/12

Tick if witness evidence is visually recorded [ ] (supply witness details on rear)

I am the above named person and I give on the address Carlisle I wish to give on statement to the police regarding the anti-social behaviour of the defendant Public house in Orchard Street Stapleford, Cambridgeshire

I have lived at this address for six and a half years with my husband. The noise is about 4-5 hrs from the pub [Redacted]

The situation has been going on for the past two years. Previously to this the pub was empty for about two months. At some as the current landlord moved in the problems began. There would be very loud noise in the garden to the point of shaking of trees including frequent bad language. There were frequently made noise but female voice could also be heard. Loud music could be heard at all times of the day. This could be in the form of amplified music and of speakers. Signature: [Redacted] Signature witnessed by: [Redacted]



RESTRICTED (when complete)

MG11(CONT)

Page No. 2 of 2

Continuation of Statement of: [REDACTED]

live music. It appeared to me that there was a linked cheque at the job as if it were a group of the landlord makes it was not at all welcoming to new customers. In fact when my brother visited he went round to the pub for a pint and said he felt ~~that~~ he was being looked up and down and that the place smelled my husband and I have been able to smell cannabis being smoked and on one occasion I heard someone shout "I want some cake, have you ~~got~~ got any cake?" I assumed that was not referring to a soft drink. Personally my main concern has been to loud music. I have double glazing and secondary glazing and I could feel the bass of the music. I have actually sat in my front room watching east pings. I have been reluctant to have french round and it has been almost impossible to enjoy social interaction in the garden. I do not necessarily think the landlord is a bad person but I definitely do not think he is suited to the job. If you are the licensee anything that goes on in your pub is under your watch. I believe if he were allowed to continue trading the pub would always have the same problems.

Signature: [REDACTED]

Signature witnessed by: [REDACTED]



RESTRICTED (when complete)

MG11

WITNESS STATEMENT

CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; Criminal Procedure Rules 2005, Rule 27.1



Statement of:  URN 



Age if under 18: 0/18 (if over 18 insert over 18) Occupation: 

This statement (consisting of 2 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 in it anything which I know to be false, or do not believe to be true.

Signature:  Date: 28/5/12

Tick if witness evidence is visually recorded  (supply witness details on rear)

I am the above named person and I wish to give a statement to the police regarding the nuisance from the house from public house in Church Street Stoughton, Cambridge over the last 1-2 years. My main issue has been noise in the form of live music at weekends. My house is approximately  yards from the pub. I have lived at this address for more than 30 years and have never had a major issue with the pub before. The live music events tend to draw larger crowds and when cashiers are smiling outside I can hear loud conversations, arguments and bad language. The pub is open all day every day and this behavior can happen during the day as well as in the evenings. The fact language comes from females on walk as males there have been fights at the location which is intimidating. Some of my neighbors have been seen selling .

Signature:  Signature witnessed by: 







WITNESS STATEMENT

CJ Act 1967, s.9; MC Act 1980, ss.5A(3) (a) and 5B; Criminal Procedure Rules 2005, Rule 27.1

URN

Statement of: Juli Wendy Stambaugh

Age if under 18: OK (if over 18 insert over 18) Occupation: licensing officer

This statement (consisting of 6 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 willfully stated in it, anything which I know to be false, or do not believe to be true.

Signature: [Signature] Date: 16th May 2012

Tick if witness evidence is visually recorded  (supply witness details on rear)

I am an Assistant Officer employed by South Cambridgeshire District Council to investigate offences under the licensing Act 2003. I have been asked to provide information of my dealings with the owner of the Longbar Public House, 2, Church Street, Skelton Road, Cambridge CB22 5D1.

I can say that George Preece Pierce George Preece took over ownership of the Longbar Public House and has been the nominated designated premises supervisor (DPS) from the 20<sup>th</sup> of May 2010. I produce a copy of the certificate to the writer as per the license in his name. (LWS1)

The first time I visited the pub to address complaints was on the 16<sup>th</sup> of June 2010. This visit I conducted with the then local officer PC Mark Hock. I had received a number of complaints from a neighbour to the pub about loud music and smoking well beyond opening hours and the hours stipulated in the premises license. On my return of the visit I provided Signature: [Signature] Signature witnessed by: .....



Continuation of Statement of: Shali Wendy STALLABASSPage No. 2 of 6

Mr PC Wade spoke to Mr Forster and fishing is the only one we were both shown. ECFA package by his father's son swimming. I mentioned it to previous then jumping by other until the fight. was then later outside the premises. There was no exchange that Mr Forster was more that time PC Wade also spoke to him about allowing kennel along. I spoke to Mr Forster about the name and I mentioned to you that depending the full license also should be the conditions were not on display. I mentioned about the people he may know if he helped is display the full premises license and no work and found the missing parts.

Following this visit no noise was reported for a few weeks. I wrote to Mr Forster on 11<sup>th</sup> August requesting the usual noise report to address and advising him that I was requesting a visit from the noise pollution officer with a view to checking a noise limiting device for the Panchis room. I called him that day and he said the noise pollution officer did a visit. I produced a copy of the letter sent to Mr Forster dated 11<sup>th</sup> August 2010 (WS2).

I believe around this time Mr Forster go with the Sando Panchis and was involved

Signature: 

Signature witnessed by: .....



Continuation of Statement of John Joseph STATABARR

make case of people removed from the case  
 pub for drug smoking and other illegal. From my  
 point I can say I visited him on the 20<sup>th</sup>  
 of August 2010 because we had been a partner  
 landlord of noise we should speak again  
 I was accompanied by PC Mark Wade. We  
 returned to Mr Foster that he should put  
 up signs on the boiler sides and in also sign  
 to prevent someone being smoked in the  
 boiler. He said that he needed to keep on top  
 of things and that this was his last warning.  
 There were a lot of people in the pub who were  
 making snide comments about us and who  
 seemed pleased our visit. I had taken a  
 bottle of beer of his since it was the end  
 of the visit. Mr Foster to remove him of the  
 condition relating to his premises is so so I provide  
 a copy of my notes from that visit (11053).  
 On the 25<sup>th</sup> of August 2010 I went to Mr  
 Foster in relation to an application for a minor  
 variation to his premises. He stated he  
 would be happy to provide a letter in  
 support of my application. I advised that Mr  
 Foster had also made a visit to the pub  
 on the 1<sup>st</sup> of September 2010 to discuss installation  
 of a noise monitor.

The next time I had made case of noise  
 complaints and some public disorder in the pub

Signature: 

Signature witnessed by: .....



Continuation of Statement of: Julia Wexler S-TALARREX Page No. 14 of 6

and surrounding area was in July 2011. Between August 2010 and July 2011 I can assure anyone FORSTER was a member of Publix until at some point in early 2011 he/she no longer was. Publix does not have the computerized membership database being looked at outside of member returned outside parties. He never returned.

As stated above from July 2011, STEROLIS got complaints from the same neighborhood of local media and not by anyone showing and speaking in the week section after 11 pm and therefore coming to his conditions in the area. I made my FORSTER aware that I was speaking to get complaints again and returned him that he needed to address the information. The above similar had not and will not be seen in the 1000 hours there are placed in install it immediately. In the letter mailed of 2011 I had made sure of further in terms of course in the pub and several that the police were monitoring and that it was better to keep a copy of close just visit. I planned to assist on Monday, Friday 9<sup>th</sup> of December. So I had this. Re Tomar and my savings. These kids was also just us who was unhappy. Publix in Dublin and not a witness and just a few more can make it. The hospital Re Tomar told me they had been a victim in the area at

Signature: [Signature] Signature witnessed by: .....



Continuation of Statement of: Julie Wendy STALLABERSPage No. 5 of 6

...the pub and we would not be checking out  
 we nor self

... I did visit the hospital on Tuesday 31st of  
 January 2012 and spoke to George Foster who  
 had 500 alcohol by people in the pub and  
 had also used a hammer to damage his vehicle  
 He returned to Tom at the pub later. He told me  
 that Roger got a drink and being taken against Tom  
 but he was being some stuff so I would explain  
 someone on the day had told to take  
 with the police and advised it could be  
 the people being drunk in the pub he had heard  
 he had been in George and visiting the pub on  
 what I said but understood the implications  
 of being drunk or being involved. George told  
 me he didn't like confrontation and I told him  
 he would be stuck in charge but George  
 appeared very relaxed.

... I left message a text to the club on Monday  
 2nd April 2012 with John Wilson, we were  
 still getting complaints of noise from the same  
 local John agreed to arrange an on site meeting  
 with Danny Mack the fire officer to discuss  
 options to the noise limiter.

... I have had a visiting officer for SAIT  
 can be applied for over 30 years and have  
 about 1000 a couple of other licenses at the  
 particular pub and those have never been any

Signature: [Signature]

Signature witnessed by: .....





## Timeline 06/09/2011 18:35:15hrs – 19:01:50hrs

<i>Time</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Camera</i>
18:35:15	Two males standing in doorway of bar and games rooms.	Camera/Ch 2
18:35:29	Males move into bar area and stop behind pillar. One male then appears to push the second male. Both males then struggle in the door way of the games room	Camera/Ch 2
18:35:40	Both males can be seen pushing/showing each other in games room.	Camera/Ch 2
18:35:01	Both males re-enter bar and approach bar. 1 <sup>st</sup> male grabs arm of second male, whom pulls away. Both males continue to push each other. Two other customers look on together with the landlord.	Camera/Ch 2
18:36:10	Male wearing chequered shirt (M1) pushes second male (M2) out the door leading to the toilets. Both males go out into garden area/rear car park	Camera/Ch 2
18:36:24	Both the other customers leave the bar and go out to rear garden area.	Camera/Ch 2
18:36:43	Customer M3 and M4 return to bar.	Camera/Ch 2
18:37:03	M1 & M2 return to bar, still squaring up to each other and pushing each other.	Camera/Ch 2
18:37:18	M1 gets in the face of M2 and rubs his head (m2) while M2 is drinking.	Camera/Ch 2
18:37:22	M1 gestures to M2 to follow him. M2 does. Both go out into the rear garden.	Camera/Ch 2
18:37:31	M3 passes glass ashtray to Landlord.	Camera/Ch 2
18:39:02	M1 & M2 return to bar.	Camera/Ch 2
18:39:08	M2 goes to sit down but M1 gestures from him to follow him out to the front.	Camera/Ch 2
18:39:38	Both males re-enter bar.	Camera/Ch 2
18:39:47	M1 continues to have a go at M2, M2 thumps bar with left fist.	Camera/Ch 2
18:40:00	M1 and M2 continue to argue.	Camera/Ch 2



	(no intervention from landlord)	
18:40:12	M1 and M2 go back into games room.	Camera/Ch 2
18:41:07	M1 and M2 again struggle in the games.	Camera/Ch 2
18:43:00	M1 and M2 again go out into rear garden/carpark.	Camera/Ch 2
18:43:27	M1 and M2 re-enter bar and stand in doorway, still arguing. They then enter bar still squaring up to each other. (Landlord in view, serves M2)	Camera/Ch 2 Camera/Ch1
18:43:44	M2 pushes M3 (strip jumper) and becomes aggressive.	Camera/Ch 2
18:43:44	M2 as above, pushes M3 out of the way and aggressively approaches M4, landlord in view does not intervene, M4 appears to be telling M2 to calm down. M2 appear very angry and agitated.	Camera/Ch 1
18:43:59	M2 slams phone down on bar, angrily points towards M1.	Camera/Ch 1
18:44:20	M2 remains angry and shouting at Landlord, being aggressive and lurching towards the bar. Landlord serves M2 with drink.	Camera/Ch 1
18:44:29	M1 again confronts M2 and both continue to argue.	Camera/Ch 2
18:44:54	M1 grabs M2 around the head and gets close to M2's right ear. M2 stumbles back slightly.	Camera/Ch 2
18:44:59	M1 and M2 stand nose to nose, still arguing – (landlord still not intervening)	Camera/Ch 2
18:45:58	M3 and M4 leave pub. M1 and M2 still arguing.	Camera/Ch 2
18:46:17	M1 grabs M2 around neck. M2 pushes M1's arm away. M2 puts head on head of M1 (both males go head to head)	Camera/Ch 2
18:46:28	M1 hits M2 on right shoulder.	Camera/Ch 2
18:47:05	Landlord gives M2 phone. M1 and M2 go out of view.	Camera/Ch 2
18:47:24	Both M1 and M2 reappear and stand at bar, still arguing.	Camera/Ch 2
18:47:35	M1 again grabs M2 around the head and goes face to face with M2	Camera/Ch 2
18:49:16	Landlord walks out into public	Camera/Ch 2

	area from behind bar and walks into games room as both M1 and M2 have again left the bar and gone out into the rear garden area.	
18:49:32	M1 and M2 re-enter the bar, both males still arguing.	Camera/Ch 2
18:50:15	Both males at the bar start to push each other. M2 pushes M1 in the chest causing bar stool to fall onto floor.	Camera/Ch 2
18:50:20	M1 slaps M2 around the face and then grabs face. Both continue to struggle with each other. Landlord enters bar while both males continue to struggle with each other.	Camera/Ch 2
18:50:27	Landlord picks stool up while M1 and M2 continue to confront each other.	Camera/Ch 2
18:51:05	M1 and M2 appear to the front of the pub, still arguing and getting in each other's faces.	Camera/Ch 11
18:51:17	M1 gestures to M2 and both go out of camera shot.	Camera/Ch 11
18:51:36	M1 and M2 re-appear in camera view. Both re-enter the pub.	Camera/Ch 11
18:51:51	M1 grabs arm of M2. Both males leave pub and go to front of pub. Landlord in public area watching what is taking place.	Camera/Ch 2
18:51:52	Both males re-appear outside	Camera/Ch 11
18:52:01	M1 grabs right arm of M2, both males still arguing and scuffling with each other.	Camera/Ch 11
18:52:11	M1 grabs M2 around the collar and pushes M2 backwards. Both males keep hold of each other and stumble back into the front door.	Camera/Ch 11
18:52:15	Both M1 and M2 continue to struggle. M1 holding onto M2's collar.	Camera/Ch 11
18:52:22	M1 grabs M2 around the neck and head.	Camera/Ch 11
18:52:28	M2 attempts to re-enter pub. M1 grabs hold of him and pulls him back out.	Camera/Ch 11
18:52:34	M2 grabs M1 by the collar and both males struggle with each	Camera/Ch 11



	other.	
18:53:46	Both males re-enter bar and continue arguing.	Camera/Ch 2
18:55:04	M1 and M2 continue to argue. M1 grabs M2 around the neck and appears to shout in his ear.	Camera/Ch 2
18:55:54	M1 and M2 still pushing each other. M2 has glass knocked from his hand by M1 causing it to drop to floor, smash and spill contents.	Camera/Ch 2
18:56:07	Landlord appears in public area and picks up broken glass up. Both M1 and M2 continue to argue.	Camera/Ch 2
18:56:55	Both M1 and M2 leave bar, landlord appears with mop and mops up spilt drink.	Camera/Ch 2
18:58:23	M1 and M2 re-enter bar.	Camera/Ch 2
18:58:58	M2 appears very agitated and angry – asks for another drink. Landlord serves M2 with drink.	Camera/Ch1
18:59:27	M1 and M2 continue to argue.	Camera/Ch1
18:59:51	M2 throws money for drink at landlord.	Camera/Ch1
19:00:40	M1 pushes M2 in face, forcing him (M2) back, nearly pushing him off his bar stool.	Camera/Ch1
19:01:12	M1 pushes M2 in the chest, forcing him (M2) back and knocking a stool back, all in clear view of landlord.M2 pushes M1 back.	Camera/Ch1
19:01:18	M1 again pushes M2 in the face.	Camera/Ch1
19:01:26	M2 goes nose to nose with M1	Camera/Ch1
19:01:50	M2 appears to head butt M1, landlord leaves bar and moves stools. Both males still arguing.	Camera/Ch1

**Key to names of males captured in CCTV from Longbow**

Male 1 – Unconfirmed – Possibly [REDACTED]

Male 2 – [REDACTED]

Male 3 – Unknown

Male 4 – [REDACTED]

Landlord – Graham Forster

Timeline 06/09/2011 19:58:05 hrs – 06/09/2011 20:09:48 hrs  
 Timeline 02/09/2011 18:31:10 hrs – 02/09/2011 18:35:27 hrs  
 Timeline 28/01/2012 00:36:16 hrs – 28/01/2012 01:02:03hrs  
 Timeline 27/01/2012 22:13:35 hrs – 27/01/2012 22:14:57 hrs

<i>Time</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Camera</i>
19:58:05	M2 (from Pt 1) enters pub drinking wearing white tee shirt – appears agitated: Landlord behind bar.	Camera / Ch 1
19:58:43	M1 enters pub in a pumped up state – still wearing same top. Immediately goes nose to nose with M2.	Camera / Ch 1
19:59:20	M1 grabs chin / mouth of M2	Camera / Ch 1
19:59:52	M1 takes hold of M2 head and goes head to head with him.	Camera / Ch 1
20:00:40	Both clearly arguing in front of landlord.	Camera / Ch 1
20:00:57	M1 clearly says something to M2 causing M2 to shout at M1 and go for a head butt. Both males in each others faces	Camera / Ch 1
20:01:00	M1 and M2 heads connect with each other. Both males exchange angry and heated words. Landlord still behind bar.	Camera / Ch 1
20:01:02	M1 pushes M2 face away with palm of right hand.	Camera / Ch 1
20:01:20	Both M1 and M2 leave bar in an angry and confrontational state.	Camera / Ch 1
20:01:22	Both males appear at front of pub in street.	Camera / Ch 15
20:01:27	Both males continue with argument, M2 jumping about with arm out. M2 then put his forehead on M1 forehead and pushes against it. M2 ends up in road.	Camera / Ch 15
20:01:33	Both males head butt each other – still being confrontational.	Camera / Ch 15
20:01:36	M2 head butts M1 and both take a swing for each other.	Camera / Ch 15
20:01:46	Both M1 and M2 appear at side of pub in car park	Camera / Ch 12



20:02:17	M1 and M2 beginning pushing each other.	Camera / Ch 12
20:02:22	M1 and M2 move further into car park.	Camera / Ch 10
20:02:42	Both males continue to argue – landlord appears.	Camera / Ch 10
20:03:08	M1 pushes M2 in chest with open palms.	Camera / Ch 10
20:03:12	M2 Pushes M1 back.	Camera / Ch 10
20:03:35	Both males continue to argue – landlord goes back into pub. M2 attempts to re-enter followed by M1 who then appears to bolt backwards as if he had been punched.	Camera / Ch 15
20:03:41	M1 pulls M2 back out into street.	Camera / Ch 15
20:03:44	M1 pushes M2 into road, both males go head to head and push each other.	Camera / Ch 15
20:03:54	Landlord again comes out but does not get involved.	Camera / Ch 15
20:04:04	Landlord re-enters pub.	Camera / Ch 15
20:08:02	M1 and M2 re-enter pub still arguing.	Camera / Ch 1
20:09:10	M2 leaves pub followed by M1.	Camera / Ch 1
20:09:14	M2 beckons to unidentifiable Rover 25 – vehicle moves across road M2 gets in.	Camera / Ch 15
20:09:48	M1 exits pub and attempts to get into rear of vehicle. M2 gets out of front seat M1 gets in. Vehicle drives off. M2 enters pub.	Camera / Ch 15
	<b>02/09/2011 – Drug Deal</b>	
18:31:10	VW Golf pulls into rear car and parks near to rear door. Driver ██████ gets out of drivers seat and goes into pub.	Camera / Ch 8
18:32:45	█████ and ██████ appear and both get into VW Golf. Peters to passenger side, ██████ to drivers side.	Camera/Ch 8
18:33:00	Both males get into vehicle.	Camera / Ch8
18:33:31	Peters hands over what appears to be cash to ██████ ██████ takes it and places it between his legs, then appears to fiddle around the drivers seat area.	Camera / Ch8
18:34:04	█████ then passes what	Camera / Ch8

	appears to look like a small white wrap from right hand to [REDACTED] accepts.	
18:35:27	Both males get out of vehicle. [REDACTED] clearly viewed holding the item (wrap) passed to him in his right hand. Both males go into pub	Camera / Ch8
	<b>28/01/2012 – Assault</b> ( [REDACTED] )	
00:36:16	[REDACTED] and group of young teenagers standing outside front of pub. [REDACTED] also with [REDACTED]s.	Camera / Ch 7
00:36:18	[REDACTED] punches young victim in face in an unprovoked attack causing young victim to stumble back.	Camera / Ch 7
00:36:30	[REDACTED] goes straight back into pub. Young group gather together and move away.	Camera / Ch 7
00:36:42	Male victim being comforted by other members of the group.	Camera / Ch 7
00:36:46	[REDACTED] and one other male (unknown) enter bar. Landlord sitting on stool in bar.	Camera / Ch 11
00:57:27	Bar area – Father of young victim enters pub with others who identify [REDACTED] as the person who has punched his son. Also present is [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]	Camera / Ch 11
00:57:47	Landlord enters pub via front door. Ignores the confrontation that is taking place, does not intervene or ask whats going on.	Camera / Ch 11
00:58:47	[REDACTED] sitting at the bar, appears to be trying to calm both parties down.	Camera / Ch 11
01:01:19	Barmaid approaches group and intervenes. As the group goes to leave, she stops [REDACTED] from following. Landlord in bar area but not involving himself with what taking place.	Camera / Ch 11
01:01:51	Group including victims father leave pub, shadowed by [REDACTED] and an unknown male.	Camera / Ch 11
01:02:03	[REDACTED] appears to berate the group including [REDACTED] At the	Camera / Ch 11



	time the landlord, who was present, did not intervene.	
	<b>27/01/2012 - [REDACTED]</b> <b>Running</b>	
22:13:35	Landlord at sitting at bar when [REDACTED] walks in and [REDACTED] approaches landlord.	Camera / Ch 11
22:13:56	[REDACTED] moves bar stool and stands close to Landlord, both start pointing at each other. Appears both are having a heated exchange of words.	Camera / Ch 11
22:14:28	Two other males, unknown, enter pub. [REDACTED] walks away from the landlord and directs a comment about the landlord to the other two males. [REDACTED] then continues to say something to the landlord before walking off.	Camera / Ch 11
22:14:57	Landlord looks shaken.	Camera / Ch 11