

BRIDGETOWN MONROE, BUCKLERSBURY, HITCHIN REPRESENTATION

I am Kuljit Sangha, Senior Police Licensing Officer for North Herts, and this representation is submitted on behalf of Hertfordshire Constabulary in support of the review of the premises licence for Bridgetown Monroe, Hitchin.

The evidence contained within this report has been compiled from police incident records, licensing enquiries, meetings with the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) and management team, CCTV reviews, witness accounts, intelligence submissions and compliance visits undertaken between April 2024 and September 2026.

This representation is submitted primarily in relation to the licensing objectives of:

- The Prevention of Crime and Disorder; and
- Public Safety.

The evidence demonstrates a pattern of violent incidents connected to, or occurring in the immediate vicinity of, the premises, together with recurring concerns regarding incident management, CCTV compliance, incident recording procedures, and the adequacy of measures in place to promote the licensing objectives.

Whilst some matters did not result in criminal proceedings due to victims declining to support police action, they remain relevant licensing considerations and are included to provide the Licensing Sub-Committee with a full understanding of police involvement with the premises and the steps taken by management in response to concerns raised.

Saturday 13th April 2024 at 1.17am - Police received a 999 call from a male who reported that he and a friend had been assaulted approximately 30 minutes earlier by a male he believed to be a doorman. The incident was reported to have occurred outside George Ph, Hitchin. Both males alleged they had been punched in the face, suffering minor facial injuries including grazing. The incident was recorded as Actual Bodily Harm (ABH). Alleged suspect was described as a male of Asian appearance, wearing a white shirt and red tie, believed to be working as a doorman. The reporting victim was contacted by the investigating officer, he confirmed that he did not wish to support police action, provide a statement, or pursue the matter further. The officer discussed investigative and out-of-court disposal options with the alleged victims, but he remained unwilling to support an investigation. As victims did not wish to pursue the matter, the alleged suspect had not been identified. The investigation was therefore closed with no further action.

From a licensing perspective further enquiries were carried out, and it was established that the alleged suspect was a doorman from Bridgetown Monroe.

On Wednesday 18th April 2024, I visited Bridgetown Monroe and spoke with Chris Dodd (DPS/Owner) regarding an alleged assault involving a doorman on 13th April 2024. Chris confirmed he was aware of the incident, having been informed by doorman before his shift started on Saturday 13th April 2024 evening. According to Chris, the doorman reported that a group of approximately five males, believed to be intoxicated, had been refused entry and became confrontational. The

BRIDGETOWN MONROE, BUCKLERSBURY, HITCHIN REPRESENTATION

doorman stated he felt threatened when the group surrounded him and struck one male in self-defence. Chris understood that only a single punch was thrown and that the group then left the area. Chris advised that he later received a phone call from a male claiming to be the victim, who stated he intended to contact police. As no officers attended the premises at the time and he received no further contact, Chris believed the matter had been resolved.

During the visit, CCTV coverage was reviewed. Whilst the premises had a camera positioned within the doorway, there was no dedicated external camera covering the frontage of the premises. Advice was given to improve external CCTV coverage, either by relocating the existing camera or installing an additional camera. Chris agreed to consider these options.

Chris spoke positively of the doorman's conduct and professionalism, stating he had been employed at the venue for approximately four to five weeks and was regarded as reliable and proportionate in his approach. Chris indicated that he remained content to continue employing him and believed he had acted appropriately in the circumstances described.

It was established that the incident had not yet been added to the premises incident log. Advice was provided to ensure the matter was recorded, and Chris confirmed he would discuss the incident further with doorman and complete the necessary records.

Chris was informed that the victim did not wish to support police action.

Sunday 26th October 2025 at 12.48am - Police officers on foot patrol in Hitchin town centre became aware of an assault that had occurred inside Bridgetown Monroe. At approximately 12.48am, officers requested additional units following reports of a fight involving glassware. On arrival, officers found the victim suffering from a large laceration above his eyebrow, with significant bleeding. Victim alleged that he had been assaulted inside the venue by the offender after a confrontation at the bar. Victim stated that the offender had been barging into him and, when challenged, assaulted him, causing injuries that required hospital treatment and stitches. Information provided by customers/staff inside the venue identified the offender. Officers located the offender in the premises toilets, where he was found with blood on his clothing and subsequently arrested on suspicion of Assault Occasioning Actual Bodily Harm (ABH). The victim required stitches. CCTV enquiries were commenced, with the owner of Bridgetown Monroe agreeing to provide footage. Offender was arrested at the scene.

Following the above incident at the premises, I met with Chris on Thursday 13th November 2025, which was a pre-arranged visit to meet to discuss the circumstances surrounding the assault. I commended the actions of the SIA door staff, who had effectively detained the suspect and assisted police, enabling officers to quickly identify, arrest and interview the offender.

Chris explained that the incident arose during a private birthday party. According to Chris, the birthday celebrant had become intoxicated and had been asked to leave the premises. The victim accidentally bumped into a member of the party, following which the offender who was attending the birthday celebrations allegedly headbutted the victim without warning.

BRIDGETOWN MONROE, BUCKLERSBURY, HITCHIN REPRESENTATION

Chris confirmed that the suspect had been barred from Bridgetown Monroe and stated that he intended to put him forward for consideration of a pubwatch ban at the next Hitchin pubwatch meeting.

We also discussed CCTV. Chris explained that officers had been unable to view footage immediately after the incident as the premises was still trading and customers remained inside. He subsequently uploaded the footage the following day as requested.

I advised Chris that, at that time, I had no concerns regarding the management or operation of the premises.

Monday 9th February 2026 at 12.07pm - Police received a call from the mother of the victim, reporting that her son had sustained a broken jaw following an assault in Hitchin during the early hours of Sunday 8th February 2026. The incident was not reported at the time either by the victim or any management team/staff/doorstaff from Bridgetown Monroe. The victim left and went home accompanied by his friends. During police enquiries, it was established that the victim was punched in the face by the suspect, directly outside Bridgetown Monroe. The victim originally went to hospital where it was ascertained that his injuries amounted to a fracture to his jaw, subsequently undergoing surgery. Both the victim and alleged suspect had been drinking in Bridgetown Monroe. This incident has been crimed as Grievous Bodily Harm (GBH) and to date continues to remain as a live investigation.

On Thursday 12th February 2026, the investigating officer enquired about CCTV footage for the outside. Chris Dodd advised that they did not have operating CCTV outside the venue. Chris provided a description of the alleged suspect, the victim was pushed out of the premises and was then hit in the face twice, also advised that they brought one group inside to separate the groups.

On Wednesday 18th February 2026, the investigating officer contacted Chris again asking if there was any available footage from inside the premises, as both victim and alleged suspect had been inside Bridgetown Monroe, prior to the altercation outside. Footage was provided for the inside camera closest to the entry/exit door, however Chris was unable to provide footage of the camera near the bar, which is where the incident took place.

On Wednesday 11th March 2026 meeting was held with Chris. Present during the meeting was myself, Chris Dodd, Georgina Bennett (prefers to be called George) – Assistant Manager. Reason for meeting was to discuss the incident which took place in the early hours of Sunday 9th February 2026. During discussions with Chris, he advised that, to his understanding, the incident stemmed from an interaction involving a customer inside the premises. He stated that a number of patrons became involved prior to SIA doorstaff intervening and that the individual concerned was subsequently escorted from the venue.

Chris advised that he did not witness the events that occurred outside the premises following the individual's removal and was therefore unable to provide any direct account of the circumstances surrounding the assault currently under investigation.

BRIDGETOWN MONROE, BUCKLESBURY, HITCHIN REPRESENTATION

In relation to the person responsible for the assault, Chris stated that he had no direct knowledge of the individual's identity. He advised that members of staff believed they may recognise a person of interest from previous visits to the premises and had drawn this to the attention of investigating officers for consideration as part of their enquiries.

As a criminal investigation remains ongoing, no further information regarding any potential suspect, evidential matters, or lines of enquiry is included within this report.

I advised Chris and George that the incident under investigation had resulted in serious injuries to the victim. Both stated that they had not been aware of the extent of the injuries at the time of the incident. Chris advised that venue staff were not aware an assault had allegedly occurred after the individual had left the premises and therefore did not make a report to police at that time. He stated that, to his understanding, those involved had dispersed from the area shortly after the incident. During the discussion, Chris advised that a person of interest had subsequently returned to the premises. However, he stated that venue staff were unaware of any alleged involvement in the incident at that stage.

Chris indicated that he would be willing to consider a referral for a pubwatch ban, should this be considered appropriate. I advised that any such consideration should await the outcome of the identification process. Chris agreed that no further action would be taken by the venue in this respect until identification investigated. Following subsequent developments in the police investigation, a referral was made by Chris to Hitchin Pubwatch. After consideration the individual concerned was issued with a pubwatch ban, preventing access to participating licensed premises within the town.

Chris advised that, should a suitable individual be identified, he would be willing to consider referring the matter to Hitchin Pubwatch for consideration of a ban. I advised that any such consideration should await the outcome of the police identification process. Chris agreed that no action would be taken by the premises in this regard until enquiries had progressed and an individual had been identified. Following subsequent developments in the police investigation, Chris made a referral to Hitchin Pubwatch. The matter was considered by the Pubwatch members and the individual concerned was issued with a Pubwatch ban, preventing access to participating licensed premises.

I asked whether the incident had been recorded in the incident book. Chris advised that it had not yet been entered. Advice was provided to ensure that the incident was recorded.

In relation to CCTV coverage, Chris advised that the premises did not have CCTV covering the area immediately outside the venue. Chris further advised that a number of internal CCTV cameras, including those covering the bar area, were not operational on the night of the incident due to an apparent electrical fault, which he believed may have been caused by a power surge. He stated that other electrical equipment, including till systems, had also been affected. As a result, the affected cameras remained out of service for the remainder of trading that evening. Chris advised that the CCTV system continued to record from cameras covering other areas of the premises. Footage from an operational camera positioned towards the front of the premises was subsequently provided to

BRIDGETOWN MONROE, BUCKLERSBURY, HITCHIN REPRESENTATION

police. No further detail regarding the content of CCTV footage is included within this report due to the ongoing criminal investigation.

The following breaches of the premises licence conditions were identified:

1. Failure to provide CCTV coverage of key external areas, including entry and exit points.
2. Failure to provide CCTV footage from the bar area where the incident initially occurred.

It was noted that the absence of external CCTV had been an ongoing issue since the premises first opened, representing a continuous breach of licence conditions.

Chris advised that an external CCTV camera had been installed during the week prior to the meeting. The camera was positioned within the porch area and provided a wide-angle view of the frontage. George also advised that electrical arrangements had been improved to reduce the likelihood of future CCTV failures.

To improve ongoing compliance:

- A written warning was issued in relation to the identified licence breaches.
- Chris accepted the warning and did not dispute it.
- The newly installed external camera would be monitored and reviewed at a later date.
- Chris and George advised they include CCTV checks within their pre-opening checklist to ensure cameras were operational before trading.

Written Warning letter dated 13th March 2026, issued. See attached.

Saturday 25th April 2026 - Police received an online report from a local resident concerning allegations of disorder and an alleged assault outside Bridgetown Monroe, Hitchin, during the early hours of Sunday 19th April 2026, between approximately 01:15hrs and 01:45hrs. The complainant alleged that, following an interaction involving a group of males and family members, Chris had behaved aggressively towards the complainant's brother and pushed him, causing him to fall into the roadway. The complainant further advised that witnesses and CCTV footage may have been available in relation to the incident. The matter was initially recorded as a common assault. The investigating officer subsequently made contact with both the reporting person and the alleged victim. Both parties confirmed that they did not wish to support police action. As a result, no evidential investigation was pursued and the matter was finalised with no further action taken.

The investigating officer subsequently informed me of the complaint and the associated crime recording. As the complainant remained concerned that Chris would become aware of the report and feared potential repercussions due to living adjacent to the premises, they did not wish for the matter to be pursued. Consequently, I was unable to discuss the allegations directly with Chris or make any further enquiries with the premises at that time.

Despite this, I conducted independent enquiries and reviewed available CCTV footage from nearby licensed premises:

- The George Ph - Footage from the camera located within the archway opposite Bridgetown Monroe was viewed. The alleged assault was not captured on this footage.

BRIDGETOWN MONROE, BUCKLERSBURY, HITCHIN REPRESENTATION

- Bar Azita - CCTV showed a vehicle passing before a male was seen stumbling backwards into the road, which is consistent with the allegation that brother had been pushed. However, the footage does not capture the person responsible for causing the male to fall.

In summary, whilst CCTV from Bar Azita captures the aftermath of the incident, there is no footage directly evidencing who, if anyone, pushed the victim, and the available footage from The George does not capture the alleged assault itself. Furthermore, both the victim and reporting person declined to support police action, resulting in the criminal investigation being closed with no further action.

As part of my enquiries, I contacted Chris by email on 14 May 2026 requesting CCTV footage from the external camera covering the entrance/porch area of Bridgetown Monroe for the period 01:00hrs to 02:00hrs on 19 April 2026. In the email, I reminded Chris that a premises licence condition requires CCTV footage to be retained for a minimum period of 28 days and requested that the footage be preserved and uploaded via a GoodSAM link, which is a Police link where members of the public/businesses can upload CCTV footage, which avoids downloading on to a usb stick.

I also sent Chris a text message on the same date advising that an email request had been sent and asking him to check both his inbox and junk folder.

Chris subsequently responded by text message, stating that the camera footage had expired after approximately 10 days. He explained this was due to issues arising from a fraudulent transaction on his bank card, which resulted in a replacement card being issued and the payment details for the Ring subscription not being updated. He advised that he would contact Ring to establish whether the footage could be recovered, although he considered this unlikely. Chris further stated that he had arranged for a different CCTV system to be installed moving forward.

As a result of Chris's response, it became apparent that the premises was not complying with the following CCTV conditions attached to the premises licence:

1. The Premises Licence Holder and Designated Premises Supervisor will ensure that viewable and unedited copies of recordings from the CCTV system are provided to Police no later than 24 hours after a request and that all recordings are retained for a minimum of 28 days.
2. The Premises Licence Holder and Designated Premises Supervisor will ensure that, prior to opening the premises to the public, the CCTV system is checked to confirm it is operating correctly and recording footage capable of being retained for a minimum of 28 days.

The inability to provide the requested footage, together with Chris's admission that recordings were only being retained for approximately 10 days, demonstrated non-compliance with the above licence conditions. The missing footage also prevented verification of the alleged assault and removed a potential source of independent evidence.

Wednesday 20th May 2026 - I contacted Chris Dodd, to arrange a meeting to discuss the CCTV provisions at the premises. This followed concerns regarding the availability and quality of CCTV footage previously provided to police. A meeting was subsequently arranged for Wednesday 24th

BRIDGETOWN MONROE, BUCKLERSBURY, HITCHIN REPRESENTATION

June 2026. During this conversation, I advised Chris that it would be beneficial to demonstrate progress towards the installation of a suitable CCTV system prior to the meeting.

During the discussion, Chris advised that, once a CCTV system had been purchased, he would provide photographs to evidence progress. However, no further communication was received from him prior to the scheduled meeting regarding either the purchase or installation of a CCTV system.

On Tuesday 16th June 2026, Chris contacted me and advised that he would be unable to attend the pre-arranged meeting. He apologised for his absence and advised that Georgina Bennett (known as George), who had recently taken on the role of manager at the Hitchin premises, would attend on behalf of the business.

Given that the meeting had been arranged more than three weeks in advance, I asked Chris Dodd why he was unable to attend and whether he was available on an alternative date the following week. Chris advised that George would attend in his place and confirmed that she was authorised to discuss the matters to be raised. The meeting therefore proceeded as originally arranged, with George representing the premises.

Monday 25th May 2026 (Bank Holiday) at approximately 12.10am - Incident at Bridgetown Monroe.

On Tuesday 26th May 2026 I made contact with Chris Dodd, in relation to an unrelated matter. During the conversation, Chris asked whether I was aware of an incident that had occurred at the premises over the Bank Holiday weekend. I advised that I had not seen any police incident log relating to the premises and assumed this was because the matter had not been reported by the premises.

Chris subsequently informed me of an incident that had taken place during a Hitchin Dance Alldayer event on Bank Holiday Sunday 24th May 2026. He stated that at approximately 12.10am a large-scale disorder broke out involving an estimated 30 persons. According to Chris, the incident initially involved two females fighting before escalating into a wider confrontation involving a large family group. He advised that those involved caused damage within the premises and that the disorder developed rapidly, describing the situation as having escalated from a calm atmosphere to a significant disturbance within a matter of seconds.

Chris advised that he became involved in attempting to separate those involved and, during the incident, both he and another individual fell to the floor whilst trying to prevent further fighting. He stated that the premises had only one SIA doorman on duty at the time. He further advised that four SIA doorstaff from The George Ph attended to assist.

Chris stated that the decision was taken to eject all persons from the premises as the most effective means of bringing the incident under control. Once patrons had been removed from the venue, those involved dispersed from the area. He advised that the premises subsequently closed at approximately 12:20am.

BRIDGETOWN MONROE, BUCKLERSBURY, HITCHIN REPRESENTATION

I asked whether police had been contacted at the time of the incident. Chris advised that police had not been called during the disorder, stating that staff were occupied dealing with the incident, securing the premises and dispersing customers. He further advised that the situation concluded quickly and those involved had left the area before police could have attended. Chris stated that the incident had been recorded in the premises incident register by the SIA doorman on duty.

The incident is of concern due to the scale of the disorder described, the number of individuals involved, the reported damage caused within the premises, and the fact that police were not contacted at the time despite what appears to have been a significant public order incident requiring intervention from multiple SIA door staff from another venue.

On 26th May 2026 the security company providing doorstaff at Bridgetown Monroe, emailed me a copy of the incident log, that the doorman completes, the following is what was written:

25h May 2026 at around 12:00am 12:05am, I was on the front entrance managing the door when the manager called me inside after noticing a fight broke out between two large groups. The DJ stopped the music and turned the lights on, which helped identify the people involved. During the incident, punches were thrown between both groups. One male punched another male in the face, causing a cut. While we were separating those involved, 3-4 additional Top Guard staff members who were outside with me. Most had just finished work from other venues, assisted in getting the situation under control quickly. Reasonable force was used to remove those involved from the venue individually, while also making sure there were no further issues outside the front entrance. Once outside, all parties involved left the area shortly afterwards. I remained outside managing the crowd and as it was closing time I started getting people to leave the venue, no further issues and the incident was logged accordingly.

Due to the absence of external CCTV coverage at Bridgetown Monroe, it was not possible to review footage from the premises own system to establish events outside the venue. As a result, I made enquiries with the Geoge public house situated opposite the premises to determine whether their CCTV system had captured the incident. I was subsequently provided with access to review the footage and can confirm the following from Bank Holiday Monday 25th May 2026:

- At 00:12hrs - CCTV shows an SIA doorman entering the premises, followed shortly afterwards by several other SIA doorman from a nearby licensed premises. Several customers are seen exiting the venue. A white male wearing dark clothing is then ejected from the premises by two doorstaff. The male attempts to re-enter but is prevented from doing so by one of the doorman.
 - At 00:13hrs - The same male is observed removing his belt and making a motion consistent with attempting to strike another male nearby. The male then leaves the area on foot in the direction of Market Place.
 - **00:14hrs:** CCTV shows a number of patrons exiting the premises. Individuals are subsequently observed either dispersing from the area or remaining outside in the road.
-

BRIDGETOWN MONROE, BUCKLERSBURY, HITCHIN REPRESENTATION

Wednesday 24/06/26 - Pre-arranged meeting held. Present during the meeting was myself, Sergeant Andrew Blackwood - Community Safety Unit (CSU) and Georgina Bennett (prefers to be called George) - Manager.

To discuss CCTV compliance, incident of Bank Holiday Monday 25th May 2026 and ongoing licensing concerns.

- George confirmed she will be taking over as full-time manager of the Hitchin premises from the following month and is currently undertaking refresher training with Chris.
- Chris was unable to attend due to commitments at another site that he has acquired in Hertford. Although this meeting was arranged approx 3 weeks in advance.

Incident of 25th May 2026 at approx 1.15am:

George confirmed that she made the 999 call at approximately 01:15hrs in relation to a disorder incident in Market Place, Hitchin. She stated that she witnessed a large fight whilst returning to Bridgetown Monroe after accompanying her father to the Sun Hotel.

George maintained that those involved were not customers of Bridgetown Monroe and that the incident was unrelated to the premises. She advised that, to the best of her knowledge, those involved had not been in the venue and appeared to be approximately 18 to 19 years old. Bridgetown Monroe have a over 21 policy. George was adamant that there was no connection between the disorder in Market Place and the earlier incident at Bridgetown Monroe.

Police attended the reported disorder. However, those present were unwilling to engage with officers or provide an account of the circumstances. Individuals suspected of involvement had left the area prior to police arrival and, in the absence of supporting evidence or complainants, no crime was recorded.

Incident of 25th May 2026 at approx 12.12am:

An incident book was produced and reviewed. Thorough Police enquiries identified an earlier incident at Bridgetown Monroe at approximately 00:12 hrs during the Hitchin Dance All Dayer event, that Bridgetown Monroe were hosting. CCTV obtained from a nearby premises showed a male being ejected, removing his belt and behaving aggressively. The 1 SIA doorman was seen to enter the premises to remove others, therefore was unaware of the male with the belt. Security logs obtained from the doorstaff company were also reviewed.

George advised that the venue was at full capacity. A fight involving one family group broke out unexpectedly. Multiple altercations appeared to occur simultaneously. Furniture was damaged and staff members were pushed to the floor. Additional SIA staff from The George Ph assisted in clearing the premises. The premises closed at approximately 12.15am due to safety concerns. The injured male seen leaving the premises was believed to be the instigator rather than the victim. No first aid was provided as the priority was to safely disperse customers. Those involved were not known to management and were attending as part of the Hitchin All Dayer event, out of town. Chris subsequently confirmed through messages with George, whilst in the meeting that the individuals involved were from the same family group.

BRIDGETOWN MONROE, BUCKLERSBURY, HITCHIN REPRESENTATION

CCTV Concerns:

Advised that the current CCTV provision was deemed inadequate, particularly the lack of external camera coverage and reliance on a Ring doorbell system. Georgina advised a new CCTV system with additional cameras was due to be installed within approximately four weeks. The upgraded system would include hard-drive storage and remote access capability via a mobile phone. Current cameras had been installed by Chris.

Breach of Premises Licence Conditions:

- It was confirmed that CCTV footage requested on 14/05/2026 could not be supplied due to recordings being retained for only 10 days rather than the required 28 day period.
- Two licence conditions were therefore identified as breached:
 - Failure to ensure CCTV footage is retained for a minimum of 28 days.
 - Failure to provide viewable, unedited CCTV footage to Police within 24 hours of request.
- Georgina confirmed she would inform Chris and was advised that a second written warning would be issued.
- Written Warning letter dated 30th June 2026, issued. See attached.

Door Supervision and Public Safety:

- Concerns were raised that one SIA door supervisor is insufficient to safely manage serious incidents.
- It was noted that doorstaff from The George Ph had previously assisted, leaving their own premises without sufficient door supervision.
- We recommended consideration of two SIA doorstaff on Friday and Saturdays. George considered this disproportionate due to the venue's trading levels and financial position.
- As a potential compromise, Georgina suggested using two SIA door staff during larger events, such as the Hitchin All Dayer.
- George suggested that they would discuss stricter entry controls with their security provider company.

Pubwatch Attendance - Concerns were raised regarding the premises lack of attendance at Pubwatch meetings. George advised that management restructuring was underway and gave assurances that a representative would attend future meetings, with herself intending to attend as manager.

At the end of the meeting George advised she would brief Chris on all matters discussed. The meeting was constructive and transparent. Significant concerns remained regarding CCTV compliance, incident management, public safety arrangements, and doorstaff numbers. Whilst George acknowledged the concerns raised and demonstrated a willingness to improve compliance, particular concern remains regarding CCTV failures, incident management arrangements and the adequacy of current SIA doorstaff levels.

BRIDGETOWN MONROE, BUCKLERSBURY, HITCHIN REPRESENTATION

Wednesday 23rd September 2026 at 12pm - I met with Chris Dodd (Business Owner/DPS) and Georgina Bennett (Manager) at the premises. The purpose of the meeting was to obtain an update regarding the installation of additional CCTV cameras previously discussed.

During the meeting, Chris advised that a new CCTV system had been installed approximately six weeks earlier. He apologised for not providing an update following installation and confirmed that the works had been completed.

The CCTV system consists of:

- One external camera covering one side of the building.
- One external camera located within the porch area covering the entrance and exit.
- One internal camera covering the bar area.
- One internal camera covering the front section of the premises.
- One internal camera covering the rear section of the premises, including the area adjacent to the toilet facilities.

It was confirmed that the cameras are capable of 360-degree rotation and tracking, however, all cameras are currently configured as static cameras and are not set to roam or automatically track movement. Advice was provided that static positioning is preferable from an evidential perspective, as roaming cameras may fail to capture incidents if directed away from the location at the relevant time.

Chris advised that footage is stored using a cloud-based system, with no hard drive located on site. CCTV footage can be accessed immediately via mobile devices and an iPad linked to the system. Both Chris Dodd and Georgina Bennett confirmed that they have full access to the system and are able to retrieve footage promptly and upload it directly to police evidence-sharing platforms when required. They advised that footage can be provided without delay, subject to officers supplying the relevant date and time parameters. It was further confirmed that the CCTV system displays the correct date and time and retains footage for a period of 31 days.

I viewed live and recorded footage via a mobile device and found the image quality to be clear and of a suitable standard for evidential purposes. Advice was given to ensure that clear signage is displayed informing customers that CCTV is in operation.

In addition, I recommended that consideration be given to the installation of a further external camera on the opposite side of the building to improve external coverage and reduce potential blind spots. I explained that incidents occurring directly beneath the existing camera may not always be fully captured. Chris acknowledged the recommendation and advised that he would arrange for an additional external camera to be installed.

Conclusion

Hertfordshire Constabulary submits that the evidence contained within this representation demonstrates a history of recurring incidents of violence and disorder connected to the premises

BRIDGETOWN MONROE, BUCKLESBURY, HITCHIN REPRESENTATION

and highlights a number of management and compliance concerns relevant to the licensing objectives.

Between April 2024 and September 2026, police have been required to investigate or make enquiries into several serious incidents linked to the premises, including allegations of assault, an incident resulting in ABH, an ongoing investigation into an incident resulting in GBH, and significant disorder occurring within the venue.

During the course of police enquiries, repeated failings were identified in respect of CCTV provision and compliance with premises licence conditions. These issues included a lack of external CCTV coverage, failures affecting key internal cameras, inadequate CCTV retention periods, and an inability to provide footage when requested by police. As detailed within this report, two written warnings were therefore issued in relation to breaches of the premises licence.

Police are also concerned by incidents where significant disorder occurred within or immediately outside the premises and where opportunities to gather evidence, identify offenders, support victims, or demonstrate compliance with licence conditions were limited due to failings in management systems and CCTV provision.

Whilst it is acknowledged that Chris Dodd and George Bennett have generally engaged with police and have taken steps to address concerns raised, including the installation of an upgraded CCTV system, improvements to recording arrangements, and greater engagement with pubwatch, these improvements have largely followed police intervention.

Hertfordshire Constabulary remains concerned that the evidence detailed within this representation demonstrates shortcomings in the management and operation of the premises which adversely impact upon the Prevention of Crime and Disorder and Public Safety licensing objectives.

The Licensing Sub-Committee is therefore invited to carefully consider the evidence presented and determine whether it is appropriate and proportionate to impose additional measures, modify existing conditions, remove the Designated Premises Supervisor, suspend the licence, or take such other action as it considers necessary for the promotion of the licensing objectives.

Thursday 8th October 2026