

Complaint Register

Ref No.	Customer/ Consumer	Complainant	Client	Site/ Location	Date Received	Nature of Complaint	Decision	Outcome	Record by
109	CONS				28/05/2023	Complainant had concerns about the legal power to remove them from site and alleged an officer had kicked them during an interaction on the Stonehenge Monument field.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. The complainant was committing criminal offences through trespassing. The situation would not have escalated if the complainant had returned to the permissive path as his companions did when requested. The officer reported the complainant tripped. The investigation found limited evidence in reference to the allegation. Refresher training to be delivered to the operational team in dealing with these scenarios.	JS
108	CUST				10/02/2023	Complainant was concerned about the conduct of the Town Centre Ranger towards their team during a request for support from retail outlet.	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Review of bodyworn video camera footage captured by the officer shows the conduct was not in line with company code of conduct. Officer to managed through company HR policies. Officer resigned from post prior to investigation being completed. No further action required.	JS
107	CUST				10/02/2023	Complainant queried the level of service being delivered compared to the contract. The complainant was dissatisfied with the lack of communication.	Partial	Complaint upheld in part. The complainant is new to the role and the information that was handed over was not accurate. The details were confirmed which satisfied the complainant's contractual concerns. After investigating, the level of communication from the account supervisor was found to not be satisfactory. This was addressed through company policies and a site meeting booked.	PH
106	CUST				07/02/2023	CCSO accused of approaching a situation involving a PCSO and a suspected shoplifter in an inappropriate way	Upheld	Complaint upheld. The outcome of the complaint showed that the officer's behaviour could have inflamed the situation for the PCSO. Additional training provided to the officer and recommendation made to re-establish a regular point of contact with the police.	PH

Complaint Register

105b	CUST	██████████	██████	██████ ██████	11/01/2023	Complainant raised concerns over 2 x security officer's conduct generally following both and internal and external complaints	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Officers not able to adapt to the heritage site needs, specifically giving a negative customer service. Officers' employment terminated due to third party pressure.	JS
105a	CONS	██████████ ██████████ ██████	██████	██████████ ██████	14/12/2022	Complainant alleged they were refused entry to the site despite being disabled and requiring to use the facilities.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. The officer had been instructed by the event manager that entry was to be denied to all due to the event being over and the site was not open to the general public. The officer followed the instructions that were clarified by the event manager. No further action required.	DW
104	CONS	██████████	██████████	██████	08/12/2022	Complainant raised a third party allegation that security officers had spent over an hour in one place and were alleged to have been overheard being negative about their role.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Operational software tracking did not correlate with the allegations made and the officers were interviewed regarding the alleged comments. No further action required.	JS
103	CUST	██████████	██████	██████ ██████████	14/11/2022	Complainant raised a complaint about videos and images found on a social media site featuring the client's logo. The complainant was also concerned they were not able to contact the officer whilst on shift when engineers required access to the site.	Upheld	Complaint upheld. The officer was managed through company HR policies and advised the videos and post were old and had been removed immediately. No further action required.	DW
102	CONS	██████████	██████	██████	26/10/2022	Complainant raised concerns about an officers conduct whilst driving on the A36. The security officer allegedly cut the complainant up.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. The driver of the complainant's vehicle was seen on vehicle footage to over take and pull in front of the security officer and use their brakes. The officer was observing the highway code and was driving under to the conditions of the road. No further action required.	JS

Complaint Register

101	CUST				13/09/2022	Complainant raised concerns about an officer's approach towards visitors at the end of the day.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. The complainant was not justified in their description of the situation. The officer felt victimised and bullied by the complainant and the client which was evidenced through the investigation report. No further action required.	JS
100	CUST				12/09/2022	Complainant raised concerns of officer's approach to an alarm response.	Partial	Complaint upheld in part due to the officer responding to a comms fail that they did not need to. The officer will be refreshed on company procedures. The concerns of how the officer approach the site were dismissed as their approach was in line with the actions required for the type of alarm. No further action required.	PH
99	CUST				23/08/2022	Complainant raised concerns over 2 x security officer's conduct generally following both internal and external complaints	Partial	Complaint upheld in part. The officers will be managed through company HR policies. The complainant were asked to ensure they were singling these officers out based on historical alleged events that precede Venture's employment and for complaints to be shared in a timely manner. No further action required.	JS
98	CUST				18/07/2022	Complainant raised concern over security officer's conduct towards staff member following a miscommunication during an incident on 17/07/2022. This resulted in security officer leaving post without permission.	Partial	Complaint partially upheld. Security Officer did leave post without sourcing suitable cover first. However, officer had become increasingly frustrated with the situation which resulted in him walking away from the situation. Officer removed himself from the conflict situation with the staff, an action we would encourage rather than getting into a public argument.	SH
97	CUST				22/04/2022	Complainant raised concerns over the conduct and performance of an officer, resulting in a request for the officer to be removed from the site with immediate effect.	Upheld	Complaint upheld. The outcome of the investigation found that the officer's conduct towards the complainant was not appropriate. Officer managed in line with company HR policies and suspended from the site. No further action required.	SH

Complaint Register

96	CUST	██████ ██████	██████	██████ ██	12/04/2022	Complainant raised a complaint about being incorrectly charged for a callout to their site on 24th March 2022	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. An officer was dispatched on request from the complainant's colleague, despite the complainant having requested and stood down a request. We rarely charge for a cancelled request, but on this occasion the officer was requested by the colleague after the stand down. The event was chargeable.	PH
95	CONS	██████	██████ ██████	██████	03/03/2022	Request for footage after officer witnessed altercation with another security third party security officer. Complaint related to involvement of our officer	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Our works in conjunction with other providers in the city centre supporting where necessary. Due to GDPR we were not able to share the footage directly with the complainant; we will fully support any Police investigation.	JS
94	CUST	██████	██████	██████	17/02/2022	Complainant raised concerns that a security office was late to site and then appeared to leave site during the shift making them unavailable to assist the residents.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. The security officer in question has operated with due diligence and there is no action required. The officer remained available to residents and was contactable through the site phone. Follow-up with complainant to be held.	DR
93	CUST	██████	██████	██████	17/02/2022	Complainant raised issues received internally relating to attitude and conduct of an officer. A couple of the points related to process matters and how the wider security team enforced these processes.	Partial	The complaint has been partially upheld and on the grounds that some of the points are not solely down to the actions of a particular security officer. Two issues (challenging visitors without clear accreditation and the visitor found wandering) are procedural and will require Simplyhealth support to resolve. The points specifically relating to the officer's behaviour have been upheld.	SH
92	CUST	██████	██ ██████ ██████	██ ██████ ██████	29/01/2022	Complainant raised concerns over the handling of an alarm response to site which resulted in them having to attend site.	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Officer did not follow company procedure and made a mistake in their handling of the alarm response. Officer managed in line with company HR policies and has been refreshed on the procedure and apologised to client. Client credited with the cost of a callout fee as a gesture of goodwill.	PH

Complaint Register

91	CUST	██████	██████	██████	31/01/2022	Complainant alleges an officer was late for their duties over the weekend causing alarm and distress for residents	Upheld	Compliant upheld. The officer was late for their shift and made no attempt to contact the duty supervisor. Officer managed in line with company HR policies.	JS
90	CUST	██████	██████	██████	26/01/2022	Complainant requests for officer not to return to site due to breaches of confidentiality and conduct whilst on shift	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Officer managed in line with company HR policies and removed from site due to unsatisfactory performance during their probation period based on client request.	JS
89	CUST	██████	██████	██████	02/02/2022	Complainant raised concerns of officer's conduct after carrying out a spot check due to alleged scarcity of the officer on the site.	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Investigation of the allegations, officer found to be in breach of the site rules. Update to site specific assignment instructions to ensure presence across all areas. Officer managed in line with company HR policies.	JS
88	CONS	██████	██████	██████	23/01/2022	Complainant alleged officer was threatening and rude towards their daughter and friends whilst they visited Salisbury Cathedral.	Upheld	Complaint upheld. The officer was carrying out their role and correct to request the group to move, however, the way in which the officer approached the situation was not to Venture's expectations. Apology sent to complainant and officer managed in line with internal HR policies.	JS
87	CONS	██████	██████	██████	31/12/2021	Complainant requests footage of son after alleging officer grabbed son during an incident in the town centre	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. The request for footage denied based on the complainant's son was not the focus of the footage and only involved by association. Unable to share due to GDPR of those who can be seen, heard and the personal content.	JS
86	CONS	██████	██████	██████	13/11/2021	Complainant alleges officer driving with threatening and aggressive behaviour.	Dismissed	Complaint upheld in part. Review of internal & external vehicle footage and vehicle tracking show the officer was not threatening or driving aggressively, however, the officer did gesticulate inappropriately which has been addressed in line with internal HR policies.	BG

Complaint Register

85	CUST	██████████	██████ ██████	██████████ ██████████	30/10/2021	Complainant raised concerns after reports of padlocks were missing as to whether they were suitably scrambled or whether they had been maliciously taken.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. The padlocks were noticeably worn and there was no damage to the gate. The gates are checked frequently with the monument being the main focus; recommendation for heavy duty padlocks to be placed on the gates	SH
84	CONS	██████████	██████████	██████ ██████ ██████	11/10/2021	Complainant reported concern after officer suggested a breach of GDPR occurred in their premises. Complainant also reported officer contacted them personally outside of office hours.	Partial	Complaint partially upheld. This situation has evolved over several months of mixed messages and misunderstandings. Lack of evidence means we cannot agree or dismiss allegations. Officer managed in line with company HR policies	JS
83	CONS	██████████	██████ ██████	██████████ ██████████	29/09/2021	Anonymous complaint received via client regarding an incident on the morning of the Autumn Equinox.	Upheld	Complaint upheld. No report was made of the incident, on review of available footage the officer in question was dismissed for gross misconduct after formal HR proceedings.	JS
82	CUST	██████████	██████████ ██████	██████ ██████████	16/09/2021	Complainant raised concerns of how city centre rangers managed a theft incident and the working relationship between the rangers themselves.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Available footage and reports were reviewed and the officers interviewed. Guidance given as best practice for future incidents and the officers managed in line with HR policies.	SH
81	CUST	██████████	████████████████████	██████████	07/09/2021	Complainant requested for an officer be removed from site due to breakdown in relationships with service users and incident that resulted in client property being damaged.	Upheld	Complaint upheld. The officer faced prolific personal verbal attacks which impacted the officer in being able to carry out their role. Officer managed through internal HR policies.	JS

Complaint Register

80	CONS	██████████	██████████	██████████ ██████████	23/08/2021	Complainant alleges the Andover BID Rangers intimidated her as they watched her park and exit her car in the free parking bay on Bridge Street, and they remained near her car, watching her until she returned and drove away on 19th August 21.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. The Rangers were carrying out business checks in throughout the town centre, many of which were along Bridge Street. The Rangers raise a report for after visiting every business on their PDA. The complainant misinterpreted the situation. Suggested the opportunity for complainant to meet the rangers to allay any fears they may have.	JS
79	CONS	██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████ ██████████ ██████████	23/08/2021	Complainant alleges the CCSO walked past and took no action to remove anti-social behaviour and drinking on Market Walk on 22nd August 21.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. CCSOs in Salisbury have no powers to remove alcohol, all matters should be past to the Police & PCSOs. The CCSOs take ASB seriously, and had they witnessed the behaviour on Market Walk, they would have addressed it and worked to move it on.	JS
78	CUST	██████████ ██████████	██████████	██████████ ██████████	07/07/2021	Complainant alleges no short term support provided to cover a site that had been found to have been broken into when they (the client) were locking up site.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Complainant was offered a number of options to support their request that could have been actioned short notice. There was a misunderstanding of requirements.	JS
77	CUST	██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████ ██████████	26/06/2021	Complainant requesting an officer be removed from site due to poor customer service and conduct whilst on shift, with specific examples provided.	Upheld	Complaint upheld, officer was removed from site as per request. Investigation outcome highlighted concerns to be addressed with client.	JS
76	CUST	██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████ ██████████	25/06/2021	Complainant raised concerns about an officer's recent mood and conduct, alleging other channels had also picked up on it	Upheld	Complaint upheld. The officer was frustrated with elements out of their/our control, and mis-directed this towards the complainant. The officer was managed in line with internal HR policies.	JS

Complaint Register

75	CONS	██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████ ██████████	08/06/2021	Complainant alleges the Covid Marshals requested they make a refund to a customer despite having already refunded them.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. The covid marshals responded to a request of support from complainant's store that the Police were not able to attend. The complainant's team gave a customers change to the wrong person; this caused the customer to become angry and threatening. The marshals descalated the situation and prevented damage to the complainant's property. The customer was given their change owed.	JS
74	CUST	██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████ ██████████	26/05/2021	Concerns raised by client's consultant with reference to alleged break down in communication and reports relating to a trespass incident just before midnight on 25/05/2021.	Dismissed	Complainant's concerns were addressed; the alleged communication break down did not occur, and the reports reflected the trespass incident. Reports and bodyworn footage from the incident is currently supporting the police investigation into the persons that trespassed.	JS
73	CONS	██████████	██████████	██████████ ██████████	25/05/2021	Complainant believes her daughter was handled with too much force by both Andover Rangers during an altercation near the bus station on the evening of Monday 25/05/2021.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. This incident was distressing and upsetting for all involved and specifically acknowledge the impact on the complainant and her daughter. Complainant's daughter was restrained to prevent herself to doing further harm to herself due to her level intoxication.	PH/JS
72	CUST	██████████	██████████	██████████	17/05/2021	On checking their CCTV, the complainant noticed that the daytime patrol officer had missed an open window, which was later brought to the customer's attention by the nighttime patrol officer.	Partial	Complaint upheld in part. The officer did record and file a report observing the windows were open, however, the client was not contacted [as per their requirements] due to the officer believing staff were still on site at the time. The officer has been refreshed with specific site instructions.	PH
71	CUST	██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████ ██████████	06/05/2021	Complainant requesting an officer be removed from site due to poor performance and conduct whilst on shift, with specific examples provided. Complainant stating that the officer is unsuitable to continue working on site.	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Security officer dismissed after formal HR investigation.	JS

Complaint Register

70	CONS	██████████	████	██████████	27/04/2021	Complainant alleged the officers are playing loud music and talking loudly between the hours of 4pm-6pm in the car park behind the complainants flat. The complainant puts her baby to bed at this time and finds the disturbance distressing. The complainant's elderly neighbour also finds it distressing.	Upheld	Complaint upheld. The officers involved were spoken to about their conduct and playing loud music in the car park prior to and at the beginning of their shift. All employees based at the office have been reminded to be considerate of our neighbours and be mindful of conversation volume. A letter of apology will be sent to residents at the complainant's address.	JS
69	CONS	██████████	██████████ ██████	██████████ ██████	03/04/2021	Complainant alleged officer's conduct to be very rude during an interaction where the officers questioned the complainant about a shoplifting occurrence. The complainant stated being upset and intimidated by the situation.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. The officers in question were acting in the remit of the role to support a third party with a report of shoplifting. Due to an inaccurate description provided by the third party caused the complainant to be misidentified and stopped. VSM acknowledge the upset this has caused the complainant and an action has been taken to improve the accuracy of descriptions prior to them being shared to avoid similar occurrences. Officer will also be reminded to considerate of how individuals may receive their actions even in the briefest of interactions.	JS
68	CUST	██████████ ██████	██████████	██████████ ██████	02/02/2021	Complainant alleged rangers mistreating a client of theirs, with a learning disability, whilst in town. Complaint received through VSM's client.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. The client was in breach of Covid-19 regulations. The rangers were considerate to the person's needs and spoke calmly and clearly. The rangers had been called to support by the complainant's colleague and at no time were concerns raised with the rangers about their actions nor was guidance offered. Complainant has suggested further training with the rangers on learning disability, and autism awareness and communication which VSM welcomes and will uptake. Investigation report shared with client to forward to complainant.	JS

Complaint Register

67	CONS	██████	████████████████████		09/12/2020	Client raised concerns regarding an alleged incident between a security officer and a service user, and the security officer's conduct towards client staff at the end of a shift [separate incident].	Partial	Complaint dismissed in part – the security officer was subjected to prolific interactions by the service user for the entire shift who declined as the shift progressed. Complaint upheld in part – The officers conduct was not appropriate towards client staff and service users [separate incident] probation review meeting was held in line with internal HR policies, along with refresher training for the site and company's code of conduct.	JS
66	CONS	██████	████████████████████		07/11/2020	Client raised concerns regarding an officer's conduct on three separate occasions	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Security officer's probation was extended after formal HR investigation and performance review.	JS
65	CONS	██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████ ██████ ██████	18/11/2020	Complainant alleged overhearing a conversation between the rangers where one made a comment in relation to a homeless man who was being loud by the market and suggesting putting him down like a dog.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed – a review of reports, body worn video footage and separately interviewing the officers could find no incident that this was related to the complaint. The information provided by the complainant was vague and likely to linked with the recent online activity in the local area. Both officers reminded to be conscious of their conduct at all times whilst on duty. No further action required.	JS
64	CONS	██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████ ██████████	20/11/2020	Complainant alleged the rangers singled out a young female for not wearing a mask based on the colour of her skin and did not approach others in groups in the same area, also not wearing masks.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed – a review of reports and separately interviewing the officers determined they did not single out anyone for any reason. Those approached were due to breaching COVID-19 regulations; officers advised to used body worn cameras for all interactions. Information supplied by the complainant suggested that this complaint may be linked to the recent targeted online activity against community teams. No further action required	JS

Complaint Register

63	CUST				21/09/2020	Mobile officer allegedly driving dangerously on Segensworth roundabout and road. Mobile officer alleged to have cut up complainant, brake check them and swear/gesture at them.	Partial	Complaint dismissed in part – Dashcam and internal camera footage, and vehicle tracking system does not show the mobile officer exceeding the speed limit or any harsh manoeuvres. Complaint upheld in part – the mobile officer did gesture out of the driver's window; this behaviour was managed through our internal HR policies. No further action required.	JS
62	CUST				25/08/2020	Mobile officers allegedly trespassing on complainant's driveway to park on to carry out overnight patrol, with loud music coming from their vehicle.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. The vehicle causing disturbance is not a Venture Security vehicle as evidenced by CCTV image. Advice given to complainant regarding re-occurrences.	JS
61	CONS				23/07/2020	Two female employees allege inappropriate behaviour by a security officer.	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Security officer dismissed for gross misconduct after formal HR investigation.	SH
60	CONS				19/07/2020	A man complained to Salisbury City Centre alleging the CCSOs are impersonating the Police, behaving aggressively.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Our CCSOs do not imitate Police, they are accredited by Wiltshire Police under the Community Safety Accreditation Scheme.	SH
59	CONS				14/07/2020	A man alleges repeated provocation and harassment in various locations across the city centre.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed; one count upheld. The complainant is seen escalating the situations, however, the officer who displayed unprofessional behaviour by one CCSO managed through internal process.	PH
58	CONS				02/07/2020	A man alleges witnessing two TCSOs assault a member of the public.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Minimum force used with a very aggressive threatening man. No complaint received by the individual. Witness statements support TCSOs actions.	DW
57	CONS				02/07/2020	Police Constable investigating CCSO alleging they used more force than necessary causing harm during two incidents.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Formal appeal made against the investigation due to injury caused to the CCSO, and witness and CCTV footage supplied to Police.	PH/SH

Complaint Register

56	CUST	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	28/05/2020	Female passenger in a car alleges dangerous driving and aggressive behaviour by a female officer in mobile patrol vehicle.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Review of the vehicle tracking system shows no signs of speeding or harsh steering at any time during the officers's shift. Complainant partner (driver) and complainant both behaved aggressively towards the officer.	PH
55	CONS	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	19/12/2019	A man requested, under GDPR, any and all information pertaining to himself relating to an incident involving a security officer.	Upheld	Footage provided after taking advice from ICO and editing out other audio from those not the complainant as advised.	PH/SH
54	CONS	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	10/09/2019	A female cyclist alleges being harassed by city centre security team whilst cycling on Anvil Bridge.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Complainant was in the wrong for cycling on the bridge. There is signage that indicates that cyclists are to dismount and failing to do so would constitute anti-social behaviour. The Anvil Bridge is in the BID area.	PH
53	CUST	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	02/09/2019	A female resident claimed the Patrol Officers were slamming doors and windows during their patrols.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed due to limited information. The patrol officers have been reminded to be mindful of residents during patrols. The resident has been reminded of the correct complaints channel by their property management.	JP
52	CONS	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	06/07/2019	A female felt the group she was with had been poorly treated during their early morning SCA visit.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. The situation was handled fairly and appropriately given the repeated ignored requests to be considerate of other visitors.	SH
51	CONS	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	21/06/2019	A man alleged witnessing a security officer using excessive force and violence during an incident with a group of individuals during Summer Solstice event.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. The complainant was not contactable when request made to see the video and images. The officers involved did their job correctly.	SH

Complaint Register

50	CONS	██████	██████ ██████	██████ ██████	09/05/2019	A man's Stone Circle Access (SCA) visit was ruined through how he felt he was treated by our security officer. The man felt he had been discriminated for his disability and bullied.	Upheld	Complaint upheld. The security officer lacked customer care and failed to consider the customer's welfare. Assignment instructions updated and apology given to the complainant who was able to rearrange their visit.	SH
49	CONS	██████	██████ ██████	██████ ██████	22/03/2019	A man accused both our security officers and a group of police officers of trying to intimidate him following an incident at the Cheese Market in Salisbury.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. It is clear that this individual was the initial aggressor and that both the security team and the police officers involved did their job correctly.	PH
48	CONS	██████	██████ ██████	██████ ██████	25/02/2019	A market stall holder accused our city centre security team of failing to take action with an intoxicated and abusive man.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Whilst the male in question may have been annoying, limited information was available to the CCSOs, no one approached them with further information whilst they observed the male. He wasn't begging and wasn't using the level of language described in complainant's email.	PH
47	CONS	██████	██████ ██████	██████ ██████	14/01/2019	CCSOs were accused of not doing anything after a market trader complained to them about rough sleepers misbehaving around the soup kitchen.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. CCSOs' role in the city was detailed and we provided more information about the soup kitchen.	PH
46	CONS	██████	██████ ██████	██████ ██████	07/01/2019	CCSO accused of physically assaulting a member of the public, breaking his necklace and injuring his neck.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. CCSO used reasonable force by catching the male in the air as the male had jumped towards him on his skateboard.	PH
45	CONS	██████	██████ ██████	██████ ██████	15/11/2018	A consumer complained after having not been allowed to pass a road closure	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Response sent to customer to explain that it was unlikely to be our officers on the closure when it was put in place.	PH

Complaint Register

44	CUST	██████████ ██████	██████	██████████ ██████	05/11/2018	The cleaner complained that she had been locked in by the security officer and that he hadn't checked properly when locking up.	Dismissed	Compliant dismissed. The cleaning team had confirmed to our officer that all cleaners were off site.	PH
43	CONS	██████████	██████ ██████	██████ ██████	28/07/2018	Consumer and others were locked into the Cathedral Close after having requested that it be left unlocked for them	Dismissed	Compliant dismissed. Emailed customer to explain that the close was locked already on our arrival. Photo evidence supplied.	PH
42	CONS	██████████ ██████	██████████ ██████	██████████ ██████	16/03/2018	Consumer who had used site to host an event had a complaint regarding conduct the Door Supervision team and the amount of time it took for them to clear the room after closing.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Complaint believed to be unjustified and customer satisfied that this was the case	PH
41	CUST	██████████	██████████	██████████ ██████	06/03/2018	Customer complaint received about the amount of time taken to respond to alarm activations at site.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Due to complexities of AI and the intricate requirements as requested by the customer, it takes the patrol officers longer to digest and respond to the alarm activations. Improvements have been made to simplify the AIs. Customer happy with response	PH
40	CONS	██████████ ██████	██████████ ██████	██████████ ██████	27/10/2017	Consumer compliant received claiming to have been prevented from using access gate as it had been closed earlier than planned. Caused great inconvenience for the couple as they had to walk further than normal in heavy rain.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Officers confirmed that they would have definitely have opened the gates to assist the couple. Gates are to be locked at 23:00hrs as per AI and was felt that complainant had attended the gate later than 2300hrs after our staff had left site. Customer happy with response.	PH

Complaint Register

39	CONS	██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████ ██████████	29/09/2017	Consumer complaint received from mother of a girl who frequents at location. Complaint alleged that an officer had told her daughter that Venture had been asked by her father to watch her as she had been smoking cannabis.	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Following extensive investigation, this was a case of mistaken identity. Officer asked to be mindful when talking to younger people at work. Customer and consumer happy with outcome.	PH
38	CUST	██████████	██████████	██████████ ██████████	30/08/2017	Customer complaint regarding a patrol officer missing an open first floor window during lock up of site.	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Officer advised to be more vigilant during locks. Apology was provided to customer.	PH
37	CUST	██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████ ██████████	24/07/2017	Customer complaint regarding frustration that the details on Als at time of renewal were out of date. Changes to layout of site and contact details had been changed	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Whilst it is the customer's responsibility to inform us of any changes to their site; a 5 year site visit should be arranged to check relevancy of details held and re-establish customer communication. New company process established.	PH
36	CONS	██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████	23/05/2017	Consumer complaint regarding a patrol officer who overtook 3 vehicles unsafely. Felt driver was not appropriately for the road conditions and put those vehicles he was overtaking in danger.	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Driver of van received verbal warning, Warned that he would be dealt with formally if it were to happen again. Asked to drive in safe and considerate manner as described in training and company driver policy.	PH
35	CONS	██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████	06/03/2017	Consumer complaint regarding a patrol officer pulling out in front of someone, not allowing enough space for lorry, which had to brake hard to avoid collision	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Patrol Officer undertook driver training on 14/03/2017 and reminded of responsibilities in relations to road law and our driver's policy, No further response was received from the complainant.	PH

Complaint Register

34	CUST				29/12/2016	Customer complaint regarding Patrol Officer who had answered an alarm activation but failed to notice that there had been a burglary in a secluded part of the site	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Whilst there were mistakes not noticing that there was some damage to the shutter bolts – all the blame cannot be placed on patrol office. ARC reported single activation in separate part of the site. Had officer been given correct information, he would have attended that location and noticed the damage to uncover the break-in. Customer was satisfied with response.	PH
33	CUST				07/12/2016	Customer complaint regarding conduct of a Security Guard and unwillingness to carry out some of the adhoc duties requested.	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Points of resolution were offered to staff member. Staff member asked to contact MD personally if he felt uncomfortable with customers' requests going forward	PH
32	CUST				10/05/2016	Customer complaint regarding conduct of a Door Supervisor	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Staff member received verbal warning and apologised to customer.	AR
31	CONS				04/05/2016	Consumer complaint regarding ejection of her son by Door Supervisors	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Unable to find any evidence to prove that door supervision team acted inappropriately under the circumstances	AR
30	CUST				15/09/2015	Customer complaint regarding a car that caused damage to grass area in car park. It was believed that the car was being driven by a Venture employee.	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Apologies letter sent with a discount for the employee's hours as compensation. Employee dismissed for gross misconduct	PH
29	CUST				06/07/2015	Customer complaint regarding two windows being left open	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Discount given to customer for patrol. Apology given. Patrol staff reminded of importance of checking all windows are secure during patrols	PH
28	CUST				28/05/2015	Customer complaint regarding failure to send reports to customer regarding numerous fire alarm fault activations	Upheld	Complaint upheld. It was agreed that the issue was an oversight and all incidents (irrespective of size) are to be reported to customer	PH

Complaint Register

27	CUST	██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████ ██████████	07/03/2015	Customer complaint back to back patrols taking place	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Patrol report was reviewed and 4 x back-to-back patrols recorded. Customer was credited for patrols. Patrol staff advised that this practice is unacceptable and there must be a period of time in between each patrol	PH
26	CUST	██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████	01/09/2014	Customer complaint regarding door supervisor leaving front door to locate customer, leaving door open for unchallenged customers to enter	Upheld	Complaint upheld. No action taken with employee as is no longer a regular and will unlikely to work as DS at this venue again. Customer agreed that this was a training issue rather than a dismissal	PH
25	CUST	██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████ ██████████	11/06/2014	Customer complaint regarding guard remaining in same position throughout shift	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Guard was informed by other member of staff to always stay in set location. It was agreed with customer than guard would move around a little more. MD will conduct random supervisory visits to check performance	PH
24	CONS	██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████ ██████████	01/10/2013	Consumer complaint regarding how they were dealt with during an altercation	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. CCTV showed consumer was mistaken about what actually happened during incident	PH
23	CONS	██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████	12/08/2013	Consumer complaint regarding staff asking group to leave at closing time	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Insufficient evidence of poor behaviour and consumer failed to respond to request for further information essential to investigation. Client does not want to pursue complaint as felt consumer was not fair	PH
22	CUST	██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████	20/03/2013	Customer complaint regarding site container being left open over the weekend	Upheld	Complaint upheld. All security operatives to check all work huts during each patrol route	DG
21	CUST	██████████	██████████ ██████████	██████████ ██████████	19/03/2013	Customer complaint regarding the Ops Manager distracting door staff allowing 2 x test purchasers to enter venue without being challenged	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Customer Area Manager informed MD that Venture would no longer be able to provide door supervision services for the venue	DG

Complaint Register

20	CUST	██████ ██████	██████ ██████	██████	12/03/2013	Consumer complaint regarding refusal of entry	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Insufficient evidence of poor behaviour and consumer failed to respond to request for further information essential to investigation	DG
19	CONS	██████	██████	██████	12/03/2013	Customer complaint regarding conduct and professionalism of some of the team	Upheld	Complaint upheld. All regular door staff will be briefed on expectations and random supervisory visits will take place by management	DG
18	CUST	██████	██████ ██████	██████	28/01/2013	Customer complaint regarding how a customer ejection was handled by the door team	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Staff members received verbal warning and advised to attend mandatory control and restraint training	DG
17	CUST	██████	██████ ██████	██████	31/01/2013	Customer was unhappy that Operations Manager was unable to provide an additional member of staff at short notice	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Account Management for this contract will be handled by MD instead. MD agreed to explore the possibility of having additional staff on standby	DG
16	CUST	██████	██████	██████	24/11/2012	Customer complaint regarding conduct of a Door Supervisor	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Staff member received verbal warning and apologised to customer	PH
15	CUST	██████	██████	██████	06/10/2012	Customer complaint regarding failure of Door Staff to record an incident	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Communications sent to all staff reminding them of the importance of prompt and thorough reporting of incidents. Regular training sessions updated to revised incident reporting. Apologies sent to customer	CR
14	CONS	██████	██████	██████	16/09/2012	Consumer unhappy with how she was ejected from the venue	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Insufficient evidence of poor behaviour and consumer failed to respond to request for further information essential to investigation.	CR
13	CONS	██████ ██████	██████	██████	30/08/2012	Consumer refused entry by Door Supervisor. She claimed it was regarding a personal matter	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. CCTV City Watch had informed staff of a troublesome group and advised refusal of service.	CR

Complaint Register

12	CONS	██████	██████ ██████	██████	08/08/2012	Consumer complaint regarding Door Supervisor conduct during a celebrity meet-and-greet and the issue with her taking too many photos	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Insufficient evidence of poor behaviour and consumer failed to respond to request for further information essential to investigation	AR
11	CONS	██████	██████	██████	19/07/2012	Consumer complaint regarding the ejection of her boyfriend	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed as boyfriend had previously been banned from the venue following an incident	PH
10	CONS	██████	██████ ██	██████	25/06/2012	Consumer complaint regarding Door Staff decision to eject son following an altercation with a group	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed as CCTV and witness testimony proved that the son's actions following his removal resulted in the altercation	AR
9	CUST	██████	██████	██████	16/03/2012	Customer questioned Door Supervisor having refused a consumer entry	Dismissed	Complaint dismissed. Customer accepted that consumer may have exaggerated situation. Implemented use of Ejection/ Rejection Log	PH
8	CONS	██████	██████ ██████	██████ ██████	18/12/2011	Consumer complaint regarding Door Supervisor refusing entry to her son	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Spoke to Door Supervisor who admitted using poor judgement and apologised to consumer	PH
7	CUST	██████	██████ ██████	██████	21/06/2011	Poor Door Supervisor attitude towards customer	Upheld	Complaint upheld. Staff member received verbal warning and apologised to customer	AR