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The object of "Project Doorkeeper" is to reduce incidents of alcohol related violence and anti-social behaviour in and around Nightclub premises in South Kesteven. The project monitors such incidents, enquires into them and informs the Council (the Licensing Authority) of the incident so that enforcement action where appropriate can be taken against club operators or door staff. The project is independent of any action taken against members of the public involved in such incidents. The project also seeks to address offences of Drug Misuse in the clubs.

The project is operated as a partnership, by the police, council, club operators and door staff.

The number of clubs operating in the South Kesteven District Council area varies between 7 -- 9. The area currently over 200 registered door staff.

The police and council introduced a 'Doorwatch' scheme, to Home Office standards in 1993. In 1998 it was realised there was an increasing number of incidents in the clubs, but no formal monitoring system which could lead to enforcement action by the Council.

In June 1998 a monitoring system was established by regular scanning of incidents. The officer dealing with the incident is then sent a pro forma by the monitoring officer, requiring them to check the club's incident book, CCTV and the registration of the door staff involved. The officer is also required to report any concerns they have or any positive comments in respect of the door staff.
In addition to any criminal proceedings concerns are passed to the council, who will then consider and where appropriate institute enforcement proceedings in respect of the club or its staff.

The effect of this policy has been that police officers deal more effectively with the clubs. The clubs are aware of the increased police attention and have raised their standards in dealing with incidents, knowing the council will take enforcement action.

The result has been a reduction in the total number of incidents over the 33-month period of the project together with a drop in the number of incidents causing concern. The number of positive comments in respect of the clubs has risen.

The drop in the number of incidents is seen as the success of the scheme and its partnership working. A further measure is the fact that other authorities have adopted the scheme and there now exists a countywide group established to disseminate the good practice learned from "Project Doorkeeper."
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Introduction

"Project Doorkeeper" is an inter agency project designed to reduce alcohol related incidents of violence and anti-social behaviour and drug misuse committed in and around nightclubs and other public entertainment licensed premises in the South Kesteven area of Lincolnshire.

The basis of the project is close monitoring of incidents occurring in such premises and follow up investigation of those incidents, allied to an agreed enforcement policy.

Background Information

The district of South Kesteven is situated in the bottom of the south western corner of Lincolnshire.

The population is just over 90,00. The main centres of population are Grantham, Stamford and Bourne. All of these towns have nightclubs and other public entertainment licensed premises.

The district is part of the Lincolnshire Police South Division, with its Headquarters in Grantham. The South Kesteven district is divided into three geographical police sectors commanded by an inspector for each sector centred on Grantham and Stamford.

The district is a Crime and Disorder Partnership in its own right. Prior to the introduction of the partnership the police and council already had a close working relationship.

The council is the Public Entertainment Licensing Authority and in 1993, in partnership with the police, introduced a 'Doorwatch' registration and training scheme, as a condition of the Public Entertainment Licence, for nightclub operators and door staff. The scheme complies with current Home Office Guidance.
The number of clubs operating in the area varies between 7 – 9. (Currently 5 in Grantham, 3 in Stamford and 1 in Boume). There is currently over 200 registered door staff. Additionally, there are a number of public houses subject to public entertainment licensing who employ door staff.

The introduction of the Crime and Disorder Act in 1999 and its associated audit process identified quality of life and the reduction of disorder, as a strategic priority for the partnership. The implementation plan for that priority is now incorporated with "Project Doorkeeper." Reducing drug abuse is also a key strategy for the Partnership.

The `Doorwatch' scheme is administered by the District Council. The scheme has a committee comprising of council members and officers, representatives of the Lincolnshire Police, together with nightclub operators and door staff.

The local Magistrates and local Drug Action Team also sit on the committee. The Council is the licensing authority and also acts as an enforcement and disciplinary body. (Due regard is paid to ECHR implications).

Objectives

1. As previously stated the main objective of the project is to reduce alcohol related violence and disorder and drug misuse in and around night club premises, by effectively monitoring incidents occurring at such premises, further investigating those incidents and where necessary implementing agreed enforcement action against the operators or their staff who are found to have acted improperly.

   No target has been set except to achieve an overall reduction of incidents in real terms, and to achieve best value indicator 127 (Reduction of violent crime)

2. To improve inter-agency partnership working to implement the reduction strategy.
To improve liaison between police, council and nightclub operators.

The project was developed as an initiative as it had been recognised, prior to the summer of 1998, there was no monitoring of incidents. The council were not being made aware of issues and therefore no enforcement action could be taken.

The decision to implement the initiative was set against the background of the rising level of alcohol related violence and disorder, together with concerns over drug misuse in night clubs. These concerns were reflected in the local press and public forums to both the police and council.

Although the project pre dates the crime and disorder strategies it serves to complement them and provides an information source to prove the overall success of the partnership in the area.

The actual recognition of the need to prioritise the project came in the Summer of 1998 when a new police representative joined the `Doorwatch’ Committee. At the time a serious incident had occurred in relation to one nightclub, that because of a lack of effective monitoring had not been properly dealt with.

Scanning

Nationally it is reported that over 80% of assaults take place whilst the offender is in drink and 75% of all assaults are not, reported to the police. (Channel 4 documentary January 2001). Although Lincolnshire as a whole clears up 82% of assaults it is reasonable to assume this is because the offender is frequently known to the victim. That may not be the case where the assault is committed in a nightclub. The offender may be unknown to the victim.

There is a further issue in that in the case of clubs both offender and victims are in drink. Often the assault is reported to the police, but not subsequently pursued. This is reflected in the attached Appendices that show the monitoring of incidents shows a high number of incidents, frequently assaults that are not pursued. This is despite the fact the Lincolnshire Police have a policy of re-contacting victims once they have had a chance to sober up. It remains the case the original complaint, made whilst in drink, is often not pursued.
It is common knowledge that nightclubs and other licensed premises have always been "HOT SPOTS" for violence and disorder. No particular scanning was carried out to show which of the premises in the district were the worst. However, local research shows one premises in Grantham had a particularly high level of incidents attributable to it and its door staff, as had one in Stamford. Whereas the sole premises in Bourne was shown to be well run and experienced few incidents.

In order to obtain accurate statistical evidence research was carried out to maintain the level of the problem by means of analysing custody records of persons arrested for alcohol related offences in Grantham and Stamford during 1999 and 2000.

They revealed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Order</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grantham** (Population approximately 30,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assaults</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Order</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stamford** (A far smaller population of approximately 18,000)

Without inspection of each custody record it is not possible to identity the time of the arrest/incident. It is, however, reasonable to assume because of the alcohol related connection many of these arrests took place during licensing hours and were in or near nightclubs.
Further scanning of information was done by means of obtaining reported crime figures for alcohol related offences of violence, disorder and damage. These are broken into sector and beat area, and relate to the town centre areas between 2200 x 0500 hours. The figures shown are the total for the 3 Crime Categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantham</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69 offences</td>
<td>23 offences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford</td>
<td>38 offences</td>
<td>113 offences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scanning of incidents at Nightclubs**

To provide the basic information to evaluate the measure of success of the monitoring scheme it was necessary to introduce a monitoring and recording system.

This proved to be simple and cost effective, as it only required the time of the monitoring officer.

The system to regularly monitor the Lincolnshire police command and control computer system, using as parameters the days and hours of operation of the clubs, together with general monitoring of the system to locate incidents reported out of licensing hours. The incidents detected were then manually entered into an incident logbook maintained by the monitoring officer for further investigation and research purposes.

The details recorded were:

- The incident reference and date;
- The location of the premises;
- The officer attending the incident;
- Brief details of the incident and the subsequent result of enquiries.

This proved sufficient to develop the project to encompass the investigation and enforcement issues so as to achieve the objectives of crime and disorder reduction.
Once the incident had been recorded the police officer dealing is sent an enquiry form enquiry acquiring them to take certain action. They are asked to provide any other information not shown on the incident record, particularly details of persons arrested and charged, or on bail. They are also required to given any information concerning the conduct of the club staff, be it good or bad.

As a condition of the Public Entertainment Licence the clubs are only allowed to employ trained door staff, who are registered with the local authority. The officer was required to check the `Door Staff’ register and physically check and sign the clubs `Doorwatch’ incident book. Also a condition of the Public Entertainment Licence, to ensure the incident is properly recorded. If this was not done at the time of the initial police attendance the officer is required to re-visit the premises and ensure the book is completed and then sign it.

Since 1999 each club is required to have an in-house CCTV system. The officer is also required to check the system, which is installed to specific Home Office standards to see if it contains anything of relevance or evidential value. They have a power to seize the tapes given by the Public Entertainment Licence conditions.

Once the officer has completed the enquiry the results are recorded, analysed and any concerns are passed to the council for appropriate enforcement action.

Where there is cause for concern the council will deal directly with the club operators or staff. If appropriate they will suspend the door staff`s registration permit, pending outcome of any court case. If convicted of an offence the door staff can be permanently suspended from the registration scheme.

The outcome of this monitoring and enforcement process has been to reduce the overall number of incidents and the total number of incidents of concern. (See Appendices A – E). This is felt to be due to the fact police officers no longer attend and deal with the incident. Instead they take a far more pro-active approach which has raised awareness of the responsibility that door staff have to deal properly with incidents in the first instance. In short, the door staff adopts a far more professional and lawful approach in dealing with the public, thus reducing the number of offences and complaints.
The door staff has also realised that the heightened level of police scrutiny actually serves to protect them from unfounded allegations from the public. Not only are incidents properly dealt with and recorded the actual incident is often recorded on CCTV which door staff realise can convict them, or protect them.

The council is delighted that incidents are properly monitored and where necessary reported to them, thus allowing them to be far more pro-active in their supervision of the premises.

**Analysis**

Analysis of the problem proved relatively simple due to the small number of premises in three separate towns. The small number of police officers made pursuing enquiries easy. Although there were problems ensuring officers accurately and speedily did what they were supposed to do so the information could be passed to the council whilst the incident was still current. To an extent those problems remain simply because of the reluctance of officers to complete the enquiry form they were sent after each incident.

Detailed analysis of the command and control system told the monitoring officer what was already known. There was one premises in Grantham and one in Stamford that were the main causes of concern. This was largely because the door staff changed almost weekly and did not seek to build up a relationship with the clientele. As the scheme progressed there was a trend for the club operators to employ agency door staff, rather than casual employees.

The profile of the offender/victims, in the case of the public was invariably males aged 18 — 24, with females rarely involved. Where the offender/victim was the door staff they were nearly always males of a slightly older age group 22 — 35.

The level of injuries, in assault cases varied from relatively minor to quite serious requiring hospital in patient treatment.

In public order cases they varied from drunkenness, to in the most serious, that of violent disorder.
Criminal damage cases were also of varying order, ranging from broken windows to damage to cars.

The victim profile of the door staff was usually one of degrees of assault. Door staff, as offenders, have been convicted of serious assaults and public order offences against the public.

The victim was predominantly the member of the public, though there were cases where the victim was door staff.

The scanning of incidents also takes into account the number of cases where police officers praised the door staff for their actions. This is always reported onto the council. Analysis knows the rise in positive comments since the introduction of the Monitoring scheme. This is believed to be coupled to the fact police officers are now involved in the training of door staff. During that training the existence of the monitoring scheme and its implications is discussed.

**Analysis of Data**

1. **Custody Record Data**

   Grantham on the full year figures 1999 and 2000 show a drop in all three categories researched. This includes if the majority of assaults were related to licensed premises the full year effect of the monitoring process and policing reduced arrests.

2. **Reported Crime Figures**

   These figures show a clear drop in the level of reported crime in Grantham town centre over the period, whereas Stamford shows a dramatic increase. The specific and more detailed information contained on the crime system provides a clear and accurate information as to the scale of the problems as and when it is required.
Figures resulting from monitoring of incidents at Nightclubs.
(See Appendices A — E)

The period under review is from the end of June 1998 to March 2001.
(33 Months)

Although the method used was relatively simple, it proved effective; four main headings were used.

- Firstly total number of incidents.
- Secondly, total number of incidents in which the club or its staff were directly involved and some form of enforcement action was taken.
- Thirdly the number of incidents which investigation showed the club not to have been involved or no action was taken/required.
  (The reasons are recorded)
- The final category is that of positive comments in respect of the club or its staff.

The research shows over the 33 months period there has been a steady drop in the total number of incidents and incidents requiring action. There has been an increase in the number of incidents not requiring formal action and in the number of positive comments (in relation to the total number of incidents).

These figures, together with those relating to arrests and recorded crime (See scanning) show there has been a measurable decrease in violent and anti-social behaviour. This is particularly true in the case of Grantham, but not in the case overall in Stamford for the reasons previously given.

The data recorded by the monitoring officer can be further analysed to give location detail, but in reality this is not needed. It is the outcome of the incident that is dealt with irrespective of where it occurred. Additionally, because all of the nightclubs are in town centres police resources are naturally concentrated there at peak times.
Little has come from the research in respect of drug misuse although it is conceded nightclubs are ‘HOT SPOTS’ of drug use. There are practical difficulties in enforcing the legislation. Although there have been drunk figures and arrests, due to the vigilance of door staff the clientele of the clubs are unlikely to co-operate with the police if detecting offences.

**Health Service Information**

In order to provide an independent data source the author has sought to obtain information from the local hospitals. This has not proved fruitful due to the fact their data recording systems are poor and the accuracy of the data cannot be confirmed. Put simply, although it is very likely there is a degree of under reporting in police figures, should a person attend the hospital with a head injury sustained in a fight at a nightclub the hospital would simply record treating a patient for a head injury. There is clearly an information gap here, which should be addressed.

**Response**

The assessment of the success of the project has largely been covered in the above sections. However, by means of a summary the figures shown below and on Appendices A – E clearly indicate a steady drop in the total number of incidents, together with a drop in the number of incidents causing concern.

1998 (Five month period) showed a total of 46 incidents at 7 clubs with 32 incidents causing concern, 14 incidents were not problems and there were only 2 positive comments in respect of the clubs on their staff. *(See Appendix A).*

1999 – 2000 (Full year comparison)

2000 figures show, a drop to 86 incidents from 133 (35%) incidents of concern dropped from 99 to 60 (39%) incidents which required no further action dropped from 34 to 26 (235). Positive comments dropped from 14 in 199 to 9 (35%). This is actually a measure of success as there was a drop in incidents themselves.
2001 Figures (To end of March 2001)
These figures confirm the trend of improvement with 21 total incidents. 9 of concern, 10 in which no further action was required and 2 positive comments.

The club operators and staff are clearly working hard to reduce problems in the clubs and at professionally in their dealings with the public, police and council.

Further measures of success are the lowered crime rates (shown in scanning) with the exception of Stamford.

The heightened level of co-operation between the partners is also seen as a success for inter-agency working, all at a nil cost, apart from officer time.

Briefly looking to the future also provides a prediction for continued success of the scheme. The partners have been keen to promote the success of the project to other local authorities. The result of this has been the three councils in the police South Division have committed themselves to working together with the police to develop their own schemes. A countywide group, involving the police and District Councils has also been established to promote a Countywide `Doorwatch' scheme, which it is anticipated would include a monitoring scheme for each area.

To further improve the project the partners intend to encourage the Drug Action teams to work in the clubs. This has already been piloted. The council hopes to introduce a `Proof of Age' scheme in the district in partnership with the County Council.

Additionally, the police and council have already introduced a protocol to comply with the Public Entertainment Licences (Drugs Misuse Act 1997), to deal with drugs issues. The partners are well aware of the possible implications of the Private Security Industry Bill and issues surrounding liquor licensing reform. Those issues will be addressed within the rules of the `Doorwatch' scheme.
Conclusion

The operation of Project "Doorkeeper" as part of the districts "Doorwatch" scheme has gradually evolved over several years. It is now firmly part of the districts' Crime and Disorder strategy and can prove its success.

By working together the partners have addressed the issues involving nightclubs. Although realistically "Doorkeeper" cannot prevent all drink related violence and anti-social behaviour it has reduced the scale of the problem.

The partners are continually looking to the future evolution of the scheme and the same police and council officers intend to tackle other problems in the district arising from late night refreshment houses, where the club patrons tend to go once the clubs are closed with the same level of enthusiasm and success.
PROJECT "DOORKEEPER"

INCIDENT ANALYSIS

1998 (Five month period) 7 Premises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of recorded incidents</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of incidents involving club and some type of police action</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of incidents in which club was not directly involved OR no police action</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of incidents from which positive comments were made by police officers in respect of door staff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One issue was referred to South Kesteven District Council.

Note: Formal monitoring of all nightclub incidents began on 26 June 1998; from that time officers dealing with such incidents were sent a monitoring form and required to check "Door Staff" registration and the "Doorwatch Incident Book."
APPENDIX B
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INCIDENT ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1999 (Full Year) 8 Premises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of recorded incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of incidents involving club and some type of police action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of incidents in which club was not directly involved OR no police action was required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of incidents from which positive comments were made by police officers in respect of door staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was necessary to refer three incidents to South Kesteven District Council.

Note 1: The author took a direct part in the training of "Doorwatch" staff from January 1999.

Note 2: From March 1999 South Kesteven District Council made as a condition of the premises Public Entertainment Licence, for the premises to install internal CCTV equipment and make the tapes available to police officers, this formed part of the checks officers were required to make.
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#### INCIDENT ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2000 (Full Year 9 Premises)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of recorded incidents</td>
<td>86 — 35.3% reduction on 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of incidents involving club AND some type of police action</td>
<td>60 — 39.39% reduction on 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of incidents in which club was not directly involved OR no police action was required</td>
<td>26 -23% reduction on 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of incidents from which positive comments were made by police officers in respect of door staff</td>
<td>9 -- 35% reduction on 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three incidents were referred to South Kesteven District Council for further action.
APPENDIX D
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INCIDENT ANALYSIS

2001. (January to March) 8 Premises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of recorded incidents</th>
<th>21*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of incidents involving club AND some type of police action</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of incidents in which club was not directly involved OR no police action was required</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of incidents from which positive comments were made by police officers in respect of door staff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Results awaited in 2 cases)

No issues were referred to South Kesteven District Council
APPENDIX "E"

Column "A" Represents Total Incidents Reported
Column "B" Represents Total Incidents requiring Police Action
Column "C" Represents Total Incidents requiring No Further Action
Column "D" Represents Total Positive Comments
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### SUMMARY OF NOTABLE INCIDENTS AND RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCIDENT</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 1998 serious fight in Market Place at Grantham. Six registered door staff involved all of whom were successfully prosecuted for assault and public order offences.</td>
<td>The six were suspended from the registration scheme. Four permanently, two appealed after 1 year and were reinstated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1999 One &quot;on duty&quot; door staff charged public order offence following an incident and successfully prosecuted</td>
<td>Remains suspended from the scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1999 Following repeated allegations of assault and the poor conduct of staff a joint investigation of club by Police and council, clubs CCTV scheme found to be inadequate.</td>
<td>Council formally required up-grading of CCTV scheme in club. This was done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2000 Two door staff convicted of public order offences.</td>
<td>Suspended from scheme for one year. One later reinstated following further training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2000 Three door staff involved in serious assault, where a member of the public was thrown in front of a revving car. Convicted at court.</td>
<td>Suspended from scheme and not reinstated to date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2000</td>
<td>Following a serious disturbance at a club, during which police officers were assaulted, assistance was given to police by door staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2000</td>
<td>Nightclub operators failed to comply with conditions of Public Entertainment Licence. (CCTV conditions) on several occasions. Brought to attention of police monitoring officer and Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2000</td>
<td>Following a serious disturbance in nightclub several members of public and door staff arrested — currently awaiting decision re prosecution. Club's CCTV provided evidence to assist investigation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>