

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



**PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

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

**I Chief Constable of West Midlands Police**

*(Insert name of applicant)*

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

**Part 1 – Premises or club premises details**

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

Prince Albert  
Railway Street,

Post town **Wolverhampton**

Post code (if known) **WV1 1LG**

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

Richard Ryan Limited.  
20, Market Street,  
Stourbridge,  
DY8 1AG .

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

15/00322/PREDPS

**Part 2 - Applicant details**

I am

Please tick ✓ yes

1) an individual, body or business which is not a responsible authority (please read guidance note 1, and complete (A) or (B) below)

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

3) a member of the club to which this application relates

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

**Wolverhampton  
City Council**



(please complete (A) below)

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

Please tick ✓ yes

Mr  Mrs  Miss  Ms  Other title WPC  
(for example, Rev)

**Surname**

Davies

**First names**

Lisa

**I am 18 years old or over**

Please tick ✓ yes



**Current postal  
address if  
different from  
premises  
address**

C/o Bilston Street, Wolverhampton Central Police,  
Bilston Street  
Wolverhampton  
WV1 3AA

**Post town**

Wolverhampton

**Post Code**

WV1 3AA

**Daytime contact telephone number**

01902 649085

**E-mail address  
(optional)**

Wv\_licensing@west-midlands.pnn.police.uk

**(B) DETAILS OF OTHER APPLICANT**

**Name and address**

n/a

**Telephone number (if any)**

n/a

**E-mail address (optional)**

n/a

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

**Wolverhampton  
City Council**



**(C) DETAILS OF RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY APPLICANT**

Name and address  WPC 4199 Davies, West Midlands Police, Central Police Station, Bilston Street, Wolverhampton, WV1 3AA.
Telephone number (if any) 101 ext 871 3194 or 01902 649085
E-mail address (optional) wv_licensing@west-midlands.pnn.police.uk

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

- 1) the prevention of crime and disorder
- 2) public safety
- 3) the prevention of public nuisance
- 4) the protection of children from harm

Please tick one or more boxes ✓

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>

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

**Wolverhampton  
City Council**



Please state the ground(s) for review

Police are defined as a 'Responsible Authority' under the Licensing Act 2003 and as such have statutory obligation to ensure that licensed premises comply with the requirements of the Act and the operating schedule relating to that premise.

The 'Prince Albert' venue is situated on Railway Drive, Wolverhampton. It is an inner city centre property, which has a large patron capacity. The hours of trading are Monday to Sunday 08.00 -07.00, alcohol sales are between 10.00 and 06.00.

The premises licence holder is 'Richard Ryan Limited' of Stourbridge Dudley Miss Sarah Hughes is the DPS, she has been in post since the 9<sup>th</sup> February this year, however, she has been an employee of the venue for a considerable time in a managerial role prior to taking the position of DPS.

Miss Hughes holds a personal licence, number DY502795, issued by Dudley Borough Council. Please note there is no suggestion within this application that the DPS Ms Hughes is inadequate. She is the third DPS in the last 18 months and by far the most competent to date. Police have a good working relationship with her and do not seek her replacement.

During the course of 2014 the venue experienced issues which culminated in an action plan proposed by the venue being submitted to Police dated the 29<sup>th</sup> June 2014.

Many issues concerned police from door entry issues, no id scanner, the DPS in place at the time Mr Bella, reported after hours drinking and drug taking at the venue. The concerns had been discussed at meetings held on Feb 21<sup>st</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup> March 25<sup>th</sup> April 2 June. As a result the venue supplied an action plan dated 29<sup>th</sup> July 2014. Meeting also took place on the 2<sup>nd</sup> July and 15<sup>th</sup> July. (***found at Appendix 1***)

By the latter part of 2014 the venue was yet again the focus of Police concerns. An intelligence log dated 11<sup>th</sup> August 2014 had been received to Police which suggested; ***The bar staff are selling Ecstasy and a certain nominal was linked to the premises and has a vested financial interest in the premises and the circulation of drugs.*** (***found at appendix 2***).

A licensing Police Officer who visited the venue on a Monday lunchtime found this individual in the grounds of the premises with management and DJ staff. The male gave false details to the officer in the presence of the manager and house DJ. This heightened the Police concerns the integrity of the staff and the association with the male. The venue staff assured Police the male was not involved in the venue or the running of it and offered a shut down and rebranding to reassure Police concerns.

**Partnership work started again with the venue as follows;**

On the 30<sup>th</sup> November at 03.50 hours, Police officers on patrol were flagged down at the venue where a male was in possession of a knife and a quantity of drugs, (which he swallowed). (***Log number 527 found at appendix 3***)

Police and DPS Sarah Hughes met on the 5<sup>th</sup> December to discuss this incident and recommended a knife arch for the venue should be introduced and was now a **serious consideration. The venue stated that they had searched the male but he had looked 'shifty' and then had dropped a knife. The venue suggested submitting a new**

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



action plan but stated they could not afford a knife arch. (*interview notation found at appendix 4*).

On the 7<sup>th</sup> December at 03.15 hours in the morning outside the venue, there was a report of a male been ejected from the premises, leaving but then returning with a knife. (*Log number 408 found at appendix 5*)

On the 8<sup>th</sup> December a meeting was held to discuss the necessity of the knife arch and Police requested a knife arch be implemented as soon as possible. (*interview notation found at appendix 6*).

On the 19<sup>th</sup> December a meeting was held with the venue staff. (*interview notation found at appendix 7*).

Present were the DPS at the present time 'Mr Tagn McGillicuddy', 'Mr Ryan McGillicuddy', (who we believed to be the Premise Licence holder) the manager Sarah Hughes the licensing Police Inspector and two licensing Police officers. Police highlighted concerns regarding the level of incidents over the later months of 2014. The purpose of the meeting was to engage in partnership working with the venue in order to address measures to meet the licensing objectives of prevention of crime and disorder and public safety.

1) Police stated it was apparent the current DPS (Mr Tagn McGillicuddy) was not a presence at the venue, and, had not taken part in the day to day running of the premises for some time.

Police suggested the manager Sarah Hughes was a more appropriately placed person for the position of DPS due to her daily attendance and running of the venue. Police had been assured on numerous occasions Ms Hughes intended to take this position but there had been delays in her application process.

2) The C.C.T.V had been found to be non-evidential in the Licensing Officers opinion, in that it did not hold facial images of the patrons as they entered the venue. The camera was positioned in such a manner that the entrance door had only an 'overview' of the patrons entering the venue, (the camera was placed on a high vantage position and was obtaining images of patrons from above their head height.) Assurances were given that the position of the entrance camera would be moved before the Christmas and New year holiday period.

3) A knife arch was again discussed however, the venue did not wish to proceed with the purchase of a knife arch stating that they believed 'searching mitts' would be more preferable. They acknowledged a measure was necessary and produced an invoice for 'searching mitts' which was given over as proof of intent to buy.

The venue staff cited a desire to move to a better clientele at the venue and stated that they did not wish to go with the knife arch due to image perception. The venue stated they were changing to a better clientele and that these present issues would not be a problem once the patronage changed.

These assurances echoed assurances made earlier in 2014 which had not proved effective and had led to this interaction partnership working.

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



There was an assurance to remove marquees in the grounds and rebrand as soon as possible. It is to be noted the venue had already closed in autumn of 2014 following the Police concerns around the Urban Street Gang nominal who was connected to the venue. It closed redecorated and 'rebranded'. The venue agreed to close again and rebrand after the Christmas holiday period. The venue discussed financial restraints.

The following specific conditions were discussed in terms of the rebranding exercise.;

- 1) Dress code – The venue stated that they had already addressed this.
- 2) Events – a request that the 'condition' to give clarification to Police for events was adhered to in order to ensure up to date intel could be provided to the venue.
- 3) Pub watch – attendance was a condition and should be adhered to.
- 4) Incident logs – these should be consistent and accurate.
- 5) I.D scanner – this 'condition' of the licence was still not in place, venue staff stated they would purchase and utilise one.
- 6) CCTV - to be evidential and positioned appropriately.

On New Year's Eve 2014, (some twelve days after the last meeting), the 'Prince Albert' had three incidents occur at the venue.

1) The venue reported over the link radio that a female patron had been assaulted in the venue. She had been bitten on the nose and face, dragged to the floor and stamped on her body and head by the offender numerous times. The offender was identified and officers attended and dealt with the offender. **(Log number 2132 found at appendix 8)**

\* The Police Duty Inspector had indicated at 01.25 hours that he believed the venue should consider closing. **(Log number 325 found at appendix 9)**

2) Incident occurred at 01.25 hours New Year's Day. A large group were refused entry into the venue and caused disorder before leaving. The venue asked for Police assistance in moving the group on. Their incident report states the group were verbally aggressive and threatening and they believed Police were required to move the group on for safety of the patrons in the venue. **(venue report form timed at 01.30 found at appendix 10)**

3) The incident occurred at 03.30 hours New Year's Day and required Police attendance and assistance to remove the problem element along, a member of the venue staff called the incident in and stated 6/8 aggressive males at the doors assaulting the door staff, fighting, weapons seen. **(Log number 863 found at 11 & 864 found at appendix 12)**

The Police Sergeant who attended has given a statement stating that when he attended the venue he would describe it as having a 'tense atmosphere' with a number of patrons giving off a 'macho' bravado. The DPS was therefore advised to close the venue. **(Police Sergeant Statement found at appendix 13).**

\*The venues report of the night and the incident at 03.40 stated they felt the club suffered minimal issues that evening **(venue report form timed at 03.40 found at appendix 14)**

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



Intelligence log dated the 9<sup>th</sup> January stated the group trying to gain entry were members of the Urban Street Gang the 'HeathTown Crew' (*Intel log found at appendix 15*)

Police Licensing received an email on the 14<sup>th</sup> January 2015 from the venue stating they would now be providing their own chosen door team in place of the current team as they stated they "had been having issues with the "head doorman". It is to be noted at the time **Freedom Security** were in place. This company is still the door company for the venue and attended the most recent meeting with venue staff and Police on the 18<sup>th</sup> June. They acknowledged the action plan still had not been submitted due to computer error issues, but that the scanner would be now be implemented. They stated they intended to close again for rebranding at the end of February 2015. (*email found at appendix 16*)

On the 16<sup>th</sup> January an email was received with the proposed action plan that had been requested at the meeting of the 19/12/14. They stated they intended to vary the licence as it was outdated for their venue. The email stated the search mitts were in now being used, C.C.T.V now had facial images with no obstructions, and a 'ID' scanner 'app' was now being utilised. (*email found at appendix 17*)

On the evenings' trading of the 15<sup>th</sup> March 2015 a fight occurred between 7 males at the venue at 02.53 hours. A member of the venues' staff called 999.

Police Officers placed an entry upon log number 315 which detailed their attendance to this 999 call. The entry upon the log at 03.18 hours states there is a large group but that no one at the location was engaging with Police. There is little information surrounding this incident detailed on the Police Log this was possibly due to the non-engagement from the venue. (*Log numbers 315 found at appendix 18*)

The submitted incident report from the venue for this incident was of 'very poor quality' it merely outlined the incident as 3 men removed for 'misbehaving', and then once outside had then disagreed with 2 other males which escalated the incident into a brawl. CTV was not provided by the venue with the report. Police were called to assist with this incident.. (*submitted incident report found at appendix 19*)

As such a further discussion took place between Police and the venue to address this matter and the poor incident log report. It is to be mentioned that the action plan submitted by the venue in July 2014 had stated '**a written log will be compiled each week in a spread sheet format, consisting of each evenings event and any incidents which will correlate with CCTV to be sent over weekly**'.

The venue later re submitted the incident report with far more detail in it, stating that the males left the venue after apologising for an incident inside but then became

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



involved in a further disagreement outside with one male sustaining a nose bleed. The detail in the second incident report, ie, offenders descriptions, and injuries to patrons, was clearly missing from the first submitted report. ***(submitted incident report found at appendix 20)***

Police licensing can confirm that in the interim period since March 2015 the venue have not reported incidents which have occurred at the venue to the licensing department.

Police have however the following reports to incident desks;

***These logs are included to demonstrate the demand the venue places regularly upon emergency resources.***

1) Disorder log - 5<sup>th</sup> April - 01.51hours – Via the link radio the venue asking for a male to be removed, officers attended and removed male. ***(Log 253 found at appendix 21)***

\*Email from venue 5/4/15 with incident report attached but the file would not download, email to venue from Police asking for report in readable format. Still awaiting details to date. ***(found at appendix 22)***

2) Disorder Log – 12<sup>th</sup> April – 01.42 hours - reported by a Police Officer – arresting male at the location for drunk and disorderly. ***(found at appendix 23)***

3) Ambulance log – 19<sup>th</sup> April – 02.53 - Ambulance Responder in attendance, male having taken MDMA ( Ecstasy) ***(found at appendix 24)***

4) Disorder 26<sup>th</sup> April - 02.19 hours – Fight outside the venue officers despatched, upon arrival all parties have left. ***(found at appendix 25)***

5) Disorder 16<sup>th</sup> may – 00.47 – 2 males fighting outside, immediate Police response, nothing found upon arrival. ***(found at appendix 26)***

6) Ambulance log – 17<sup>th</sup> May - 00.06 male has had a fit, taken to hospital***(found at appendix 27)***

7) Ambulance log – 25<sup>th</sup> May – 01.45 female intoxicated, possibly drink spiked, taken to hospital. ***(found at appendix 28)***

***The two logs below are the knife assault incident of the 14/6/15***

- \* -

8) Disorder – 14<sup>th</sup> June 04.08 – Anonymous caller stating 'fighting - 'with bottles ***(log 474 found at appendix 29)***

9) Disorder – 14<sup>th</sup> June 05.46 – casualty at Walsall Hospital reporting male presented with stab wound to neck. \* Please see below for full details\* ***(log 568 found at appendix 30) This is a twenty one page log and has had sensitive information removed from it for the purposes of the hearing***

- \* -

10) Disorder – 28<sup>th</sup> June – 02.00 Male has been ejected from venue - has struggled with door staff – taken to hospital believed to have taken 3 Ecstasy tablets. ***(log 387 found at appendix 31)***



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



The incident on Sunday 14<sup>th</sup> June 2015 is detailed below;

On this date the venue was open to trade to the public.  
We are also aware that a birthday party was taking place and guests for the party were in the premises.

No prior notification of the birthday party booking had been provided to the Police licensing department.  
Police note that there is a condition placed upon the licence which specifies; '28 days' notice of all 'events' with risk assessment, details of door supervisors, DJ's, performers and capacity levels should to be given to the licensing department at Wolverhampton Central Police Station'.  
The venue will state that this was merely a booth booked out to a party which is normal practice at the venue and does not constitute an event which they need to inform Police of.

Also noted in the venue's licence is a condition to purchase an I.D. scanner. We can see a scanner in use but the female who appears to operate the scanner is not always present. As a result not all patrons were scanned into the venue that evening.

In the early hours of the following morning at 05.46 hours a male presented at Walsall Manor Hospital, with a knife wound to his neck.  
After surgery he cited the location of the assault upon his person to be the Prince Albert Pub, Wolverhampton.  
The victim was a patron of the venue that night and was a guest of the birthday party that was taking place.  
He has stated that males surrounded him inside the washroom of the venue and conducted an unprovoked attack upon him.  
As a result the victim then left the premises. He is seen to leave and speak to the female door staff as he goes.  
Once outside the victim and his friend do not leave the area and appear to loiter. There are numerous members of the public around including the venue's DJ.  
The door is still being operated to allow patrons out of the venue and the interior camera will place the female door staff at this door.

The offenders leave the venue through this door shortly afterwards and the two parties have a confrontation directly outside the venue entrance.

It is here, less than four metres from the entrance to the venue, that the victim is stabbed to his neck with a what is believed to be a bladed instrument, The victim was in surgery for several hours. A male from the group is also seen clutching an upturned glass bottle and a threatening/defensive manner.

This investigation is a live on-going police matter at the time of writing and offenders are sought by Police.

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



CCTV footage retrieved from the Prince Albert venue will show the incident occurring. CCTV footage times are 'considerably out' in relation to the correct time, Facial imaging now on the CCTV has allowed stills of offenders to be utilised to assist in the investigation.

The outside camera is approximately 1 hour later than the actual time and the interior camera is approximately 1 hour slower than the actual time meaning the cameras are approximately 2 hours out of sync with each other.

This has made the viewing of footage to investigate this matter extremely frustrating. The ID scanner, although in use, has some poor images and repeated images of patrons. CCTV will show that not all patrons were scanned in.

We note with grave concern that the female door staff is not seen to be active in this incident even though she is in close proximity. She is not responsive nor does she report the matter later to Police. We have no account from this staff member as to why she is not seen to deal with this incident. We clearly see members of staff come from inside the venue who **would** have walked past her to see what is going on outside.

One staff member sees the droplets of blood on the pavement from the victim's neck wound and puts his hand to his mouth. Another staff member also comes out to assess the incident. Both staff males return inside the venue and go back to sweeping up.

Numerous members of the public are clearly aware of the incident and are watching it from inside the venue fencing the female door staff member is less than two metres from them.

No report is received from the venue, however an anonymous member of the public calls the police. Police attend.

The staff who have been identified as going out to look at the incident and blood are seen to speak with the Police Inspector in attendance.

The Police Inspector who attends has given an evidential statement to confirm he spoke to staff who told him they had not called Police, and that they did not know why Police had been called and that everything was fine. (*statement found at appendix 32*)

Four days later on 18<sup>th</sup> June venue staff management and door team management all attended Bilston Street Police station to discuss this incident. They all stated they had no knowledge of the incident prior to the Police contacting them to secure evidence following the injured male going to hospital. (*notation of meeting found at appendix 33*)

Police are happy that from CCTV you can see members of venue staff were aware of this incident. We are not clear why the venue staff have not reported this to the management team.

If it is that management were not made aware by staff then this is a real issue for the venue in terms of public safety.

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



In addition, intelligence received by Police over the period of concern from summer 2014 to the present day, raises concerns as to a staff association with drugs being taken/supplied from the venue and Gang attendance.

It is important to say that intelligence logs listed below are from sources which are classed as 'E4 intelligence'.

This means the information could have come from several places such as 'anonymous callers', 'crime stoppers calls', 'individuals telling Police officers information. Therefore, Police consider them as from an 'untested source', in that we cannot judge if they are true or false.

Below are further intelligence logs Police have received which raise concerns. Some of the intelligence is very recent. These are

- 1) 3<sup>rd</sup> Sept 14 - Drug dealing is taking place on the top floor of the Prince Albert **(found at appendix 34)**
- 2) 5<sup>th</sup> Dec 14 – A girlfriend of a Urban Street Gang nominal had a fight with another female inside the venue. **(notation of meeting found at appendix 35)**
- 3) 9<sup>th</sup> Jan 15 – Urban Street Gang 'The Heath Town Crew' are the group that attended the Prince Albert Pub on News Year's Eve, were refused entry and kicked the door down and pushed their way into the venue with force. Door staff were observed wearing stab proof vests. **(intel log found at appendix 15 earlier in the papers)**
- 4) 12<sup>th</sup> June 15 – Prince albert are knowingly allowing drug dealers onto the premises because they receive a cut of the sale of the drugs **(intel log found at appendix 36)**
- 5) 15<sup>th</sup> June 15 - Staff are allowing drugs to be taken at the premises staff members have been seen snorting coke (cocaine). Drugs **(intel log found at appendix 37)**

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



Concerns which have focused around the venue now cover a long period of time, from the action plan detailed at 29<sup>th</sup> June 2014, to the present day.

The Police have conducted meetings, phone calls, emails and many hours of partnership work, but feel that this methodology is failing to ensure public safety and prevent crime and disorder at the venue.

As recently as Friday 26<sup>th</sup> June the venue was indebted to the radio link company for £390.00. This payment had to be made before the venue received the radio link facility back from the B.I.D partnership group.

Police are always concerned when such a vital piece of equipment is a cost concern to the venue. We seek to highlight this is licence condition. The radio link company have allowed the venue to retain the system even though money was outstanding.

We are told that the radio is now in place but it is obviously a consideration that there is a nod to financial constraints in terms of measures implemented at the venue. The radio link system links the Prince Albert to other venues in the night time economy in Wolverhampton and Police believe it to be essential and is a condition of the licence. *(email from B.I.D. company to venue at appendix 38)*

Further concerns to be noted are that Police are unsure as to how much knowledge 'Mr Richard Bourne' has to incidents at, and the running of, 'The Prince Albert' venue.

Mr Bourne is now the sole director of 'Richard Ryan Limited' the Premises Licence Holder company.

Police were aware at some point last year that Mr Bourne had been very poorly and was not involved in the day to day running of the venue .

This in itself was not an issue as a close working relationship had been formed with Mr Ryan McGillicuddy of Richard Ryan Limited, who we believed to be a director of 'Richard Ryan Limited'.

Police were recently surprised to find Mr Ryan McGillicuddy resigned as a director of this company on the 15<sup>th</sup> April 2014. He failed to disclose this in any of the partnership meetings at the latter part of 2014 into 2015 and moreover submitted an application relating to the premises dated as recently as 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2015 citing himself as a director for Prince Albert. This was a hand written application so it was not a standard computerised form on which this information has been submitted in error. *(table and chairs application form from Mr Ryan McGillicuddy at appendix 39)*

At the last meeting with the venue management on the 18<sup>th</sup> June this year, Mr Ryan McGillicuddy conceded this was the case, when he was asked who review papers would be addressed to for this matter. He stated that he is still a partner in the business but not a director. He is not therefore the Premises Licence Holder.

On Thursday 2nd July the DPS Miss Sarah Hughes attended and watched footage of the stabbing incident on CCTV and answered questions relating to the footage under caution.

When questioned as to the actions of the door woman and the staff members, in not dealing/not reporting to Police/ not reporting to management, she stated we would have to ask her staff as she could offer no reasoning to their actions. *(interview notes of the DPS watching the cctv footage at appendix 40)*

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

**Wolverhampton**  
City Council



The CCTV footage of the incident of 14<sup>th</sup> June will be available to watch if required at any hearing set.

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

**Wolverhampton  
City Council**



Please provide as much information as possible to support the application. West Midlands Police are gravely concerned due to the serious nature of the recent incident .

The DPS states she had no knowledge of the incident prior to contact from Police the following day, and licensing can confirm that the department has conducted an interview in which Ms Hughes states she did not have this incident reported to her by her staff. Police are not suggesting that Ms Hughes knew of this incident .

As it is now evidenced that staff clearly had knowledge of some sort of incident we are concerned that no report was made to her or any other member of the management team or to Police.

This may then have compromised a crime scene which may have been of serious consequence. Police raise concerns as to the effectiveness of the running of the venue and public safety at the location from further crime and disorder when there is such poor communication between the venue staff to their own management and to Police.

Reassurances have been provided many times to Police over the last twelve months with the commencement of two action plans, two periods of rebranding, changes of staff, replacing of door staff, and replacement of DPS. This has failed to resolve incidents of disorder and moreover the use of weapons. Measures which appear to be stringent are still failing to control matters of serious incident at the premises, and are un-enforceable.

West Midlands Police are in support of local and independent businesses such as the 'The Prince Albert', however we cannot continue to support this venue when there is a lack of understanding and noncompliance of licensing objectives within the licensing legislation. The venue management will state that they believe they are already doing all they can to meet the licensing objectives of public safety and prevention of crime and disorder.

If it is truly the case that the venue itself cannot identify any other measures which can ensure these licensing objectives, Police have no option than to seek the revocation of the Prince Albert Licence in order to prevent further serious offences occurring, and ensure the safety of the public. If revocation is not considered Police would seek to ensure the premises places stringent measures in and around the venue in order to prevent further incidents of crime, particularly involving weapons.

**We have major concerns over the vulnerability of the perimeter of the venue. The search that was conducted on the offender was not altogether thorough but was conducted. We fear weapons/drugs could easily be passed through the perimeter fencing of the venue to a patron even if they had been thoroughly searched upon entry.**

**The Prince Albert has open fencing all around its footprint, therefore, unlike other venues with an entrance door, (where searching and knife arches can be static) any implement/substances can be passed through the fencing into the venue. The venue management have stated they too have concerns as to how a weapon could have entered the premises on the night of the wounding and feel their searching is adequate. Police will state that there is currently no assurance that a weapon could not just simply be passed through the fencing.**

**A potential solution to combat this vulnerability would be to not hold outside events on the terrace area after 21.00 hours. This would ensure all patrons were searched and then remained inside the premises during operational hours. A solid fence would not resolve this as items could be thrown over.**

**Any patrons already at the venue on the terrace prior to night time operation would be required to re-enter the premise at 21.00 hours via the knife arch and be subject to the door search policy and the terrace to be closed from 21.00 hours onwards.**

**We would seek to implement a static knife arch at the single point of entry to be used in conjunction with the search mitts.**

**A 100% search policy to be implemented and an emptying of all pockets/handbags into a bowl before passing through the knife arch, any indication of metal from the knife arch to be further investigated by the search mitts.**

**Anyone refusing to abide by the door entry search policy to not be admitted to the venue.**

**The venue is a late night venue which allows a longer period of alcohol consumption and this can be considered to be a contributing factor to persons utilising weapons with such disregard to the potential ramifications. We would request that the supply of alcohol till 06.00 be reduced to 03.00 hours with a last entry of 01.30 hours.**

**We would ask that a better ID scanner be implemented at the premises as the ID scanner currently being used has duplicated, obtained poor images and is subject to operator error or none use.**

**Police Seek to ensure the safety of all members of the public and staff of this venue to be paramount. Our intention is prevent further crime and disorder at the venue and to promote positive venue and Police interaction for the future if the licence is retained.**

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

**Wolverhampton  
City Council**



Please tick  yes

Have you made an application for review relating to the premises before

If yes please state the date of that application

Day	Month	Year
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

n/a

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

**Wolverhampton  
City Council**



Please tick ✓


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

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

Part 3 – Signatures (please read guidance note 4)

Signature of applicant or applicant's solicitor or other duly authorised agent (please read guidance note 5). If signing on behalf of the applicant please state in what capacity.

Signature

 WPC LIAISON OFFICER

Date

9th July 2015

Capacity

Police Licensing Constable

Contact name (where not previously given) and postal address for correspondence associated with this application (please read guidance note 6)

Post town

Post Code

Telephone number (if any)

If you would prefer us to correspond with you using an e-mail address your e-mail address (optional) [wv\\_licensing@west-midlands.pnn.police.uk](mailto:wv_licensing@west-midlands.pnn.police.uk)



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

**Wolverhampton  
City Council**



**Notes for Guidance**

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

