
From: Barrett, Anthony (RJE) UHNM <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 15 November 2023 11:42
To: licensing
Subject: Representation regarding Wolstanton Social Club Complaint
Attachments: Mr John Glover Req for Info Letter.docx

Importance: High
Sensitivity: Confidential

Categories: Mel

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe.

Good afternoon.

I have contacted you to offer my representation towards Wolstanton Social Club with their ongoing dispute with their neighbour, Mr John Glover.

I find it appalling that one complaining neighbour should be allowed to hold the club to account in such obvious vindictive circumstances.

Please allow me to explain my background.

My family, extended family and myself have used the club for a number of years as we initially used to attend the Monday Night Quiz night held since our previous premises, The Cavalier in Bradwell, unfortunately closed down to be replaced by a housing estate. Over the years we have attended many events, held several family parties including my 40th and 50th birthday party, my wife's 40th birthday, funeral wakes and most recently my daughter's 18th Birthday party which was on Saturday 12th August. I believe if you check your records, that this particular date caused no cause for concern and the behaviour on the night was impeccable, but I would appreciate you correcting me otherwise if this is incorrect.

Following COVID, myself and another colleague took over the running of the Monday Night Quiz and have expanded it from a previous membership of around 5 teams - 30 people - to now regularly having at least 10 teams with 65 regular attenders. As far as I am aware, this has never raised any cause for concern and we even adjusted the times of the quiz to finish at 10:30pm to accommodate Mr Glover's complaints.

As part of this representation, I refer to the Licensing objectives raised, namely
1. Prevention of Crime and Disorder
2. Prevention of Public Nuisance.

However, I do also believe that the objectives of
3. Public Safety and
4. Protection of Children from Harm

are also relevant in this case.

1. Prevention of crime and disorder.

The sheer nature of a Working Men's Club means that alcohol is served and sometimes patrons can be louder when leaving the premises. I do believe the club have made every reasonable attempt to balance this by building a sound screening wall, adding extra sound insulation, as well as limiting the entertainment and reducing social events to members only. We regularly advise our quiz members to consider neighbours and to minimise the noise when leaving the premises. Mr Glover is not the only neighbour opposite the club, and does not even live directly opposite the doors. However, there have been no other complaints, to my knowledge, from any other neighbours, many of whom have been directly asked and have no concerns over the Club's patrons. The club was running long before Mr Glover lived there and if these issues are such a concern, then why would he consider moving into a house opposite a local club and not at least expect some activity especially at weekends? I believe the club has taken every practicable step necessary to mitigate these disturbances but it appears Mr Glover has complained about such things as wheelchair users making noise when loading their wheelchair into the car amongst other things. The fact he is now using his own illness to gain sympathy when he is stating disabled users as a cause for disturbance just reeks of hypocrisy as is the fact that he actually used to be a member and patron of the club, therefore may have one time contributed to noise when leaving the club which he is so readily quick to criticise.

I personally, have not seen any evidence of crime related to the club, Mr Glover states that his car had been vandalised, but this is not on the club premises, and I would ask if he had proof that this was a direct result of a patron leaving the club? My car has been vandalised on more than one occasion and I do not live near a club or pub. Vandalism happens, unfortunately, and the club cannot be held responsible for damage occurring in the street, off their premises. I am not aware of any other issues related to reported crimes, but I am willing to be informed if you wish to declare any firm evidence with regards to this matter.

2. Prevention of Public Nuisance.

As stated previously I do believe the club has taken more than necessary steps to placate Mr Glover in his concerns and adjust their business to adapt their trading. Social events are held to a minimum and remain members only, Monday Night Quiz was moved to an earlier start to finish at 10:30pm so it reduced the risk of unsocial noise after 11pm, all clubs, darts, pool and bingo finish at a reasonable time to allow patrons to leave earlier and minimise later night disruption. Licensing is until 11pm and most events end either just prior to this in the week or as soon as practicable afterwards, with only weekends usually finishing after 11pm, with most clientele vacating the premises soon afterwards. Unfortunately, Mr Glover is deluded if he thinks there should be no noise at all from activities in the club and as there have been more than reasonable steps taking to mitigate this, at a cost to the club of lost business and trade, I believe that his complaint should not be upheld. One single individual complainant should not be holding the club to ransom when there have been no other concerns raised from adjoining neighbours who live in a more direct line to the club entrance than Mr Glover. I would challenge his expectations of what he would expect from a Working Men's Club in relation to noise and public nuisance, and what his expectation was when he moved opposite to such an establishment which he used to frequent. I believe that some degree of noise should be expected from an establishment such as this, but the Club has gone above and beyond to meet Mr Glover to discuss the issues, which I understand he has rejected. The club has also taken exceptional steps to mitigate any disturbance and nuisance and this should be applauded, not threatened with licensing reviews and Mr Glover himself needs to be held accountable for his behaviours in an obvious victimisation and bullying campaign

3. Public Safety

Mr Glover has been recording patrons leaving the club, without their consent, and uploading the footage to You Tube in the public domain, again without individuals consent, and tagging it with comments such as "Noisy Neighbours" and "Unsocial Behaviour". This can be detrimental to individuals' well-being and personal and professional lives if individuals are recognised and can be considered a slander by grouping video footage under these tags. Mr Glover has also demonstrated homophobic behaviour by complaining about 2 men kissing on the car park. I wonder if he has made any complaints about a man and a woman kissing? I would appreciate if you can inform me if this is the case.

By recording people, groups and individuals, leaving the club, he is breaking data protection laws, under the Data Protection Act 2018 which states that:

Everyone responsible for using personal data has to follow strict rules called 'data protection principles'. They must make sure the information is:

- used fairly, lawfully and transparently**
- used for specified, explicit purposes**
- used in a way that is adequate, relevant and limited to only what is necessary**
- accurate and, where necessary, kept up to date**
- kept for no longer than is necessary**
- handled in a way that ensures appropriate security, including protection against unlawful or unauthorised processing, access, loss, destruction or damage**

I have personally written directly to Mr Glover to ask for any video footage containing my image or any images of my family to be sent to myself or destroyed. I have attached the letter for reference, but to this date have not yet received a response or acknowledgement. I will be considering legal advice if there continues to be no response from Mr Glover. There was no previous indication that recording equipment in use until very recently where he has added a small yellow sticker, very difficult to see from the road, to state that he is using recording equipment as per guidance from the Data Protection Act 2018 around CCTV footage:

"You have the right to request CCTV footage of yourself.

You need to make a request to the owner of the CCTV system. You can do this either in writing or verbally.

The owner's details are usually written on a sign attached to the camera, unless the owner is obvious (like a shop).

Tell them you're requesting information held about you under data protection law. The Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) has guidance about getting copies of your personal data.

Provide information to help the owner identify you, for example:

- a specific date and time**
- proof of your identity**
- a description of yourself**

The CCTV owner must usually provide the footage free of charge within 1 calendar month.

Most CCTV footage is deleted 30 days after it's recorded.

The CCTV owner might not be allowed to share any footage if:

- other people can be seen in it**
- they're not able to edit out people to protect their identity**

The CCTV owner can invite you to a viewing of the footage if:

- they're unable to provide you with the footage itself**
- you agree to that arrangement**

They can refuse your request if sharing the footage could put an ongoing criminal investigation at risk.

I have also previously stated that he has made complaints against wheelchair users being noisy in loading their wheelchairs into their cars. Mr Glover has now, in an article for The Sentinel and Stoke-on-Trent Live, stated that he is due to undergo cancer treatment and does not want his recovery disturbed. He is complaining about disabled people and then using his own illness to gain sympathy. My wife has had cancer and treatment, and the support and social activity of the Club has been exemplary in her recovery and bringing about a normality whilst she underwent treatment. Whilst it is unfortunate that Mr Glover has been diagnosed with cancer and is due to undergo treatment, he cannot use this as an attack on the club as many other people have disabilities or illnesses that use the club and find well-being beneficial positivity in the social and supportive aspect of attending. The Club also actively supports the Community and have provided an AED for Community use out of fundraising and also help with various charities.

4. Protection of Children from Harm - Mr Glover has obtained video footage of people leaving the club without their permission and uploaded it to social media. This includes my own children. I have not given this permission and I am concerned that footage of my, and other patrons children, has been uploaded to social media such as You Tube without consent, and as such, risks putting children's anonymity to question as well as risking their protection from abuse of this footage. It is not only my own children, but friends and family, boys football team etc. This must be addressed and Mr Glover must be ordered to stop obtaining footage without consent especially of minors. The fact that this footage is used in a complaint against the club is reprehensible.

In summary, I find it abhorrent that the vindictive and uncompromising complaints of one individual should be held to account against a Club that has been part of the active Community for over 100 years, long before Mr Glover ever moved there. His expectations of what to expect when moving opposite to such an establishment is laughable and if you chose to live opposite an active club, then some tolerance needs to be considered. If Mr Glover had moved next to a school, would he complain about the noise children make and try and get the school closed down? I believe the principles are the same, this appears to be a personal vendetta by this individual who actually used to be a patron and member. The complaint therefore is hypocritical and due to the issues I have purveyed above I fully support Wolstanton Social Club in its case raised by Mr Glover. I consider his complaint to be unjustified, baseless and spiteful. The Club have made more than reasonable adjustments to placate this one individual, and as far as I am aware, there have been no other issues raised from any other neighbours in the vicinity who live in a more direct location to the club entrance than Mr Glover.

A great number of people rely on the Club for their livelihood, entertainment and social interaction. It would be reprehensible if this should end due to one individual with a personal grudge for whatever reason. The Club is a heart of the local community and has been for over 100 years with no other significant issues raised against it, no other complainants and no significant problems with its management.

I sincerely hope that the unjustified complainant nature of this individual is not allowed to impact or damage an otherwise indispensable core of the local community and part of the rich history of Wolstanton.

If any of the points raised in this communication can be factually and evidently disproven, then I am happy for you to recontact me at this email address for correction.

Please do not hesitate to get in touch if you require any further input or clarification on any of the points raised.

Regards.

Thanks,

Tony

**Anthony Barrett - RN DipN; BSc (Hons)
Urology ANP, NMP and Nurse Cystoscopist**

*c/o CNS Office - 'D' Block
Royal Stoke University Hospital
University Hospitals Of North Midlands
Newcastle Road
Newcastle Under Lyme
ST4 6QG
Email: anthony.barrett@uhn.nhs.uk
Tel: (01782) 671150*