

## **STATEMENT OF WITNESS**

In the matter of an application for a premises licence under the Licensing Act 2003

**STATEMENT OF: PC 1671 Kim HOLLIS**

**Age of Witness (if over 18 enter) : Over 18**

**Occupation of Witness: Licensing Officer North Yorkshire Police**

**Address: North Yorkshire Police, Fulford, York, YO10 4BY**

**This statement (consisting of 8 pages) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false, or do not believe to be true.**

1. I am Police Licensing Officer for North Yorkshire Police, and I am authorised to act on behalf of the Chief Constable of North Yorkshire Police in matters relating to the Licensing Act 2003, Gambling Act 2005, Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2014 and Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982. I joined North Yorkshire Police in 2005 and began my role within the licensing department in April 2018. My area of responsibility is York.
2. I am aware of the current statement of Licensing policy and Cumulative impact assessment area (CIA) for York which came into effect in March 2025.
3. On 14<sup>th</sup> July 2025 I received an email from Meghan Waldron, Solicitor at Lupton Fawcett solicitors asking to have a quick discussion with me regarding a potential licence application for a premises on North Street, York, which sits within the CIA.
4. 16<sup>th</sup> July I had a phone conversation with Meghan Waldron. I was advised of an applicant wanting to licence Little J's LGBTQI+ bar until late and no specific details

were provided around operating hours or conditions proposed but a general chat about the position of North Yorkshire Police regarding applications for the CIA area for a late night bar with no food. We briefly discussed that a late night alcohol licence, with no provision of food and without a robust operating schedule would likely be met with objections but that police would take into consideration York's statement of licensing policy and the statutory 182 guidance and that any application would be considered on its own merits. I advised I was happy to discuss further if there were specific details or a draft application before or during the consultation process and made the offer to meet with the applicant or representative to discuss in detail if required.

5. On the 4<sup>th</sup> August a Temporary Event Notice was received by North Yorkshire Police licensing inbox for one day event at Little J, North Street. This was allocated to myself as licensing officer for the city centre. The application was made by Graham Dykes and advised the event was set to take place on 21<sup>st</sup> August from 1600-0200hrs the following day.
6. On 5<sup>th</sup> August an application was received by the licensing inbox for new grant premise licence at Little Jay Limited. York licensing authority forward application to North Yorkshire Police licensing team as per normal process as a responsible authority for consultation. End of representation date confirmed as 02/09/25. This was allocated to my caseload for me to review.
7. On 7<sup>th</sup> August I contact Graham Dykes via telephone call to discuss the TEN submitted on 4<sup>th</sup> August (police have 72 hours to respond to this matter). As the TEN was during the Ebor festival and going to be held on the popular 'ladies day' until 02:00hrs I asked about provisions in place to mitigate risk. I recommended that the premises supply 2 SIA registered door staff for the based on recent disorder in the city following on from the races and due to the premises sitting within Cumulative Impact Area. The

discussions took place over a couple of calls and Mr Dykes agreed to have the 2 SIA door staff for the event. I requested this was confirmed in email to prevent any need for a police objection which was provided by Mr Dykes.

During the discussions regarding the TEN I mentioned that I was aware there was a licence application in for the premises and that I would like to meet and discuss the application and view the premises. I suggested that the meeting take place with my colleague from the Licensing authority, Helen Sefton and explained that this was the usual approach and how we could look to discuss any potential concerns with the premises sitting within the CIA. Mr Dykes asked me a lot of questions and I explained that we could go through it in person and that as yet I had not had an opportunity to look at the application. Mr Dykes agreed a meeting arranged for 14<sup>th</sup> August 2025 to discuss the licensing application with myself and Helen Sefton. I sent out a meeting request via email the same day to confirm this meeting to both Mr Dykes and Helen Sefton.

8. On 10<sup>th</sup> August I received a very lengthy email from Mr Dykes copying in Meghan Waldron (solicitor) which explained he no longer wished to meet myself and Helen Sefton as planned and that meetings should not be held jointly and to communicate with Meghan Waldron regarding the application. He detailed that he believed the sticking points from North Yorkshire Police were the timings of the venue. He also attached a letter in support of the venue. I responded to Mr Dykes and Meghan Waldron copying in Helen Sefton Senior licensing officer CYC stating I was sorry to hear this and clarifying that any supporting documentations for the application should not be forwarded to North Yorkshire Police but instead the Licensing authority. I asked Meghan to arrange a date for a visit and advised Helen that the meeting was now cancelled for her reference. I did not forward any supporting documents on and kept my

email brief. Please see attached exhibit **KH/1** Initial email exchange with Graham Dykes. I received one reply from Mr Dykes stating I had shared a confidential email and privileged information to the licensing authority 'on the excuse of sending them the attachment' without attaching a document. To clarify I did not send the attachment, nor did I mean to do so. My email simply stated that Mr Dykes should forward these the licensing authority and that I had copied them in for his reference. There were no confidential markings on the email and no privileged information.

9. Following this email exchange, I was advised by my management that Mr Dykes had written to the other Sergeant in our team, Sgt Stoffel, and Superintendent Haywood-Noble as well as an external individual, advising that he was 'having issues' with me making claims that 'She is entrenched in her view on dismissing LGBTQI+ Crime and Safety statistics and reports' and that I was entrenched in my view to object to this application. I can clarify that at this point, as advised to Mr Dykes, I had yet to even read the full application, and I had not advised that I would be making an objection to the application at any point. Mr Dykes was advised by Sgt Stoffel how to make a formal complaint should he wish to. I am also made aware that Mr Dykes attended the Police station at Fulford Road in order to ask to speak with my supervision about my 'conduct'. I have exhibited the email exchange as **KH/2**.

10. Due to the email expressing concerns over myself the decision was made that Sgt Booth, my direct supervisor, would respond to the application and she advised me she would contact the solicitor, Meghan Waldron. I was made aware that Lupton Fawcett solicitors had advised Sgt Booth that they were no longer representing Mr Dykes and Sgt Booth began to communicate with Mr Dykes regarding the application.

11. On 22<sup>nd</sup> August I received an email from Graham Dykes as Sgt Booth was on leave and Mr Dykes had agreed to speak with me about the proposed conditions in Sgt

Booth's absence. There had been several attempts by Sgt Booth to arrange to meet with Mr Dykes and offered for him to meet with me and Sgt Booth via teams before she went onto leave but this had not been possible. In the email he made reference to meeting and also that the Challenge 25 condition proposed was not suitable. At this stage in the application, I needed him to consider the conditions proposed and was not in a position to meet with him so I replied to Mr Dykes and asked for the suggested wording of the Challenge 25 condition for me to look at and consider and asked that he considered the conditions sent by Sgt Booth on the 19<sup>th</sup> August. Mr Dykes responded to me with a lengthy email and some proposal for re-wording conditions. I exhibit this email as **KH/3**

12. On 26<sup>th</sup> August I replied to Mr Dykes with some proposed re-wording of conditions in order to try and work with him on the points he raised. I exhibit **KH/4**. A reply was received from Mr Dykes accepting the wording of the Challenge 25 condition but not to the accepting the condition relating to door staff. He detailed at length the venue having an iron bar gate fitted and that this would mitigate the risk and requirement for 2 door staff. He proposed further re-wording of the door staff condition and asked for me to consider this. I looked through all the information provided but I was unable to agree to the re-wording and further to comment on the fire safety as this would not be appropriate and I felt the conditions proposed were not suitable. I replied on 28<sup>th</sup> August to this effect and later that day Mr Dykes sent a further email to myself, Superintendent Ed Haywood-Noble, Chief Inspector Jon Aldred, Sgt Tom Stoffel and Jake Furby (member of the public) asking if I had made an oversight in my proposal over the wording of the condition and asking all to advise if this is the position of North Yorkshire Police.

13. On 28<sup>th</sup> August I responded to Mr Dykes to advise that there was no oversight and that these conditions proposed were the conditions proposed by North Yorkshire Police and confirmed the proposed conditions. I exhibit this as **KH/5**

14. On 29<sup>th</sup> October Mr Dykes sent an email to Superintendent Ed Haywood-Nobel, Chief Inspector Jon Aldred, Sgt Stoffel and Jake Furby (Member of the public) asking for them to consider the re-wording and expressing the opinion that York Licensing Officers were being unreasonable and entrenched in objection towards the application from day one. I replied to confirm that I was authorised to deal with this licence application on behalf of North Yorkshire Police. A further email was also sent by Mr Dykes to Sgt Stoffel to ask who my supervisor is and asking for clarity on this. Sgt Stoffel replied and explained that ordinarily Sgt Booth is my supervisor and that in her absence he would cover the whole team. He also encouraged Mr Dykes to work with me on this application.

Mr Dykes sent a response to this email to Sgt Stoffel, Superintendent Ed Haywood-Nobel, Chief Inspector Jon Aldred, Inspector Andy Godfrey and Jake Furby (member of the public) requesting a decision on his rewording of conditions in relation to the licence application and making a further complaint about me describing me as 'unreasonable and entrenched officer' but I was not included in this email chain at the time. He was encouraged to continue communicating with myself as I was the person dealing with the application at this time. **KH/6** and **KH/7**

15. On 31<sup>st</sup> August I received an email from Mr Dykes titled 'Suspension of existing LGBTQI+ support groups' where he advised myself, Sgt Booth and Sgt Stoffel that he would agree 'under protest' to the conditions proposed by North Yorkshire Police. As I

was aware now that Mr Dykes had made a further complaint about my conduct and was stating that he would agree only under protest, citing that this would suspend existing LGBTQI+ activities I did not feel it would be appropriate to make this agreement.

Further, there had been no comments from Mr Dykes regarding the concerns over the proposed operating times for the venue. I advised him by reply that I would discuss this application with Sgt Booth on her return from leave and we would respond to him after this as it was not appropriate for me to respond to him at this time. I exhibit this as **KH/8**

16. I fully updated Sgt Booth on her return from leave which was on 2<sup>nd</sup> September and the last day for representations for the licence application for Little J.

Sgt Booth submitted a representation to the Licensing authority this same day setting out the position of North Yorkshire Police.

17. On 10<sup>th</sup> of September, I was advised by Sgt Booth that I was required to attend Fulford road Police station in order to meet with Mr Dykes at 12.30 with her to discuss the Police representation to Little J licence application. I attended Fulford and waited for the appointment to which Mr Dykes did not arrive nor any other representative for Little J. No meeting was held.

18. I have been the York licensing officer for the last 7 years and during this time I have provided the Police response to applications within the cumulative impact area. I have always highlighted to applicants that should a representation be submitted by North Yorkshire Police, it is for the Licensing Committee to decide on the granting of the licence. In respect of this application, I have attempted to work with the applicant throughout this consultation period with the same professionalism, fairness and integrity as always. The applicant has, on numerous occasions, sought to email various senior officers within North Yorkshire Police each time he has not agreed with my decision making and has repeatedly questioned my ability to make decisions within my own

specialism for which I have the recognised qualification. In my experience if the applicant is not amenable to conditions proposed it is their right to refuse agreement to these and the legal process under licensing would be followed, and a Police representation submitted in order to give the applicant fair process for the licensing committee to make the determination. I have not before in my professional capacity, encountered an applicant who has tried to work outside of the normal process or approach senior officers who are not qualified in the licensing act 2003 in order to seek a different determination.

I believe that the facts stated in this statement are true. I understand that proceedings for contempt of court may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief in its truth.

**Signed: PC 1671 HOLLIS**

**Date: 22/09/25**