

Witness Name: PETER ANDREWS

Exhibits: PA/01-PA/08

Dated: 31/07/2025

THE SOUTHPORT INQUIRY

FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF PETER ANDREWS

I, **PETER ANDREWS**, will say as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. I am Police Constable Peter Andrews of Lancashire Constabulary.
2. This witness statement is made to assist the Southport Inquiry (the "**Inquiry**") with the matters set out in the Rule 9 Request dated 10 July 2025.

INTRODUCTORY MATTERS

3. I am currently a Police Constable with Lancashire Constabulary. My collar number is 275.
4. I joined Lancashire Constabulary on 1 March 2004 aged 25. I had left school at 16 years of age and had initially attended sixth form college for a couple years. I then attended Blackpool College and completed a business and tourism Higher National Diploma. This took 2 years to complete. I then worked for Camp America near New York for 6 months. Following this I moved to Jersey and worked there for just over three years as a member of bar staff in a hotel. Whilst still in Jersey I applied to join Lancashire Constabulary. I was successful in my application and, as stated, began my police career on 1 March 2004.
5. I have been in uniform all my career. I did work on a secondment for a 12-month period from November 2019 as a police liaison officer for fracking. Apart from that secondment, I have spent 20 years as a response officer.

6. When the reporting of the dreadful Southport attacks appeared on television in late July 2024 and with the subsequent naming of AR, I did not realise that I had ever met him or dealt with him during the course of my duties. It took around a month until I realised I had had a brief previous involvement with him, and I only realised that I had had some form of involvement with AR when a colleague informed me. I do not have a lot of memory about the incident so I have had to refresh my memory from looking at the various contemporaneous records.

FACTUAL NARRATIVE OF INVOLVEMENT

7. I started my tour of duty on 13 May 2022 at 22:00. My shift on this night was from 22:00 until 07:00 the following morning, based out of Ormskirk Police Station. On starting the shift, my sergeant put me in call sign 'SBCAR7N'. The make-up of the call sign is such that 'SB' denotes Skelmersdale, 'CAR7' denotes that I was police vehicle number 7 for that area and 'N' denotes that I was on the night shift. The call sign I was assigned involved me driving a marked police vehicle with emergency lights and sirens. I would have been in full Police uniform. The Storm system has been checked, and I have been told that prior to attending this incident, I attended 3 other incidents.
8. I can see from incident log LC-20220514-0219 that the original 999 call received into Lancashire Constabulary Force Control Room had been sent electronically to them by Merseyside Police. I think that due to AR's home address being so close to the border with Merseyside Police, the 999 call had been misdirected to Merseyside. As AR's home address is within the Lancashire Constabulary boundary, that is why Merseyside Police transferred the incident to Lancashire Constabulary to deal with and respond to. When Merseyside Police electronically transferred their incident log to us, it created an incident log with reference LC-20220514-0219. I exhibit the LC-20220514-0219 incident log (LC-81)) as **PA/01 - LANC000047** The incident log was received into Lancashire Constabulary's Force Control Room at 04:26 on 14 May 2022.
9. I also can see that the Force Control Room received a call from Cheshire Police who had also received a misdirected 999 call for the same incident. A separate log was created for this with reference LC-20220514-0226 and was closed as a duplicate. I exhibit the LC-20220514-0226 incident log (LC-82) as **PA/02 - LANC000048**

10. The content of the incident log received from Merseyside Police was that they had received a 999 call from a female requesting the Police but then the call was terminated. It was noted on the incident log that all the Merseyside Police operator heard was "we need the police please". The log says that there was no sign of distress or disturbance on the call. The call was received from a mobile number from which previous calls had been made by AR's parents. I think this is how the Control Room must have realised that this call was from AR's home address.

11. I was deployed to deal with this incident at 04:32, with my colleague PC 2669 Greg Franzoni having been deployed a few minutes earlier at 04:30. I attended with my emergency lights and sirens activated due to this being a 999 call and requiring an immediate police response.

12. I have now had an opportunity to listen to a recording of the radio transmission from the Force Control Room requesting that PC 2669 Franzoni and I attend the incident. The radio operator asked PC Franzoni to attend the incident first. The operator passed information to PC Franzoni that an abandoned 999 call had been received from AR's home address and that a female was heard to request the police. It was also reported to PC Franzoni that there were some recent 'high risk vulnerable child' markers on the address in relation to AR. It was said that AR was believed to be a vulnerable child and that there had been some 'concerns with knives'. I was asked by the Force Control Room to back up PC Franzoni. I would have been listening to the radio at the time, however I simply cannot remember whether I was asked to back up PC Franzoni or whether I would have registered the earlier reference to the knives which had been made before I was requested to attend. I produce the radio transmission of PC Franzoni and me being deployed to the incident dated 14 May 2022 (LC-159) as exhibit **PA/03** - **LANC000430**

13. I arrived at the address at 04:54 and PC Franzoni arrived at 04:56. The property was a new build semi-detached house. I cannot specifically recall but I normally advise the Force Control Room that I have arrived at the scene by using status messaging which involves holding down button 3 on my personal radio. This then automatically shows me at scene on the incident log. When I arrived at the scene, I asked over the radio how far away PC Franzoni was, and I was advised he was about a minute away. I think I awaited PC Franzoni's arrival before we knocked on the front door. I exhibit the radio transmission of me asking the Force Control Room for PC Franzoni's time of arrival at this incident (LC-160) as **PA/04** - **LANC000431**

14. We knocked on the door and AR's father answered. I do not recall speaking with his mother. Whilst I do not specifically remember the conversation with AR's father, I have refreshed my memory from reviewing the investigation report. AR's father told us that his son was autistic and that he had been causing issues within the home. He told us that AR had awoken in the middle of the night demanding a laptop. He said that AR had been denied access to the computer earlier in the night and when AR had been denied access to the computer AR started to throw food around the kitchen. AR's father also told us that AR had locked himself in the bathroom and overfilled the bathtub which had caused the electricity to short out.

15. AR's father told me that he was struggling with both his children. He said that AR was refusing to attend his educational establishment and had been refusing to take his prescribed medication for his autism the prior week which was having a profound effect on him. He also told me that AR was getting older and stronger and that they were struggling to cope with him. He did tell me that he was going to contact CAMHS and his GP.

16. I understood that AR had a sibling, but I did not meet this child and cannot say whether they were male or female. [DPA]

[DPA]

[DPA] I recall the house was a

small new build semi-detached house with a driveway. The house was untidy and smelt unpleasant, there were various items thrown on the floor, causing obstructions as you walk around the house. I wouldn't describe it as being in such a state that I would consider it to be neglectful.

17. I do recall speaking to AR. He was upstairs in his bedroom sitting or kneeling on the floor. I cannot recall what he was wearing. I only remember that he was a slim built young black male. I tried to speak to him about his behaviour and what had happened that evening, but he would not engage with me. I do not think he spoke one word to me. I do not think he even looked at me. AR wasn't rude in anyway; he just wouldn't speak. I was doing most of the talking but PC Franzoni was also present in AR's bedroom.

18. It would seem from reviewing the incident log that I was at the house for about half an hour. My radio would normally transmit GPS signals of where I was and I know some checks have been done to establish for how long I was at address. However, I have been informed that the GPS data for this time is not available. I have been provided with information to show that the vulnerable child report was submitted via Pronto. I cannot

remember whether I submitted it on my Samsung, or on the computer desktop. It would have taken me around 25 to 30 minutes to drive from AR's address to Ormskirk Police Station and I can see that I updated the incident log at 05:55.

19. I did not view this incident with AR as a criminal matter. I very much considered this to be a vulnerable child matter due to the fact that no offences had been disclosed.
20. At 05:55 I updated the incident log and advised that I would shortly submit a high-risk vulnerable child investigation. The update I put on the log also explained that AR had been throwing food and water around the house as he was looking for a laptop. I also updated it to say that AR was severely autistic and had not been taking his medication, that he had been spoken to in his bedroom and had agreed to go to sleep, and that his parents will contact CAMHS and the GP for help and advice.
21. At 06:17 on 14 May 2022, I created an investigation report which was classified as a high-risk vulnerable child report which was given reference number 04/86720/22. The system shows that I inputted the report onto the Pronto system which then immediately transferred the data onto the main Connect system. I exhibit the 14 May 2022 Pronto report inputted by me (LC-192) as **PA/05** – **LANC000253** I exhibit the 14 May 2022 high-risk vulnerable child investigation report 04/86720/22 (LC-85) as **PA/06** **LANC000093**
22. When I input the details onto the Pronto system, because a child was involved, it will also have asked for me to submit details for an Op Encompass referral. My understanding of Op Encompass is that when a referral is completed, it sends a notification to the child's school straight away, so that they know the Police have been involved with that child. I input the details for the Op Encompass referral onto the system when I was creating the 14 May 2022 high-risk vulnerable child investigation report 04/86720/22. I selected the school as 'Out of Force' as I was told AR was not currently in education and there was no other suitable option to select. The system then automatically sends an email to the relevant authority to advise them. I exhibit the 14 May 2022 Op Encompass referral email (LC-119) as **PA/07** – **LANC000124**
23. I can now see from the 14 May 2022 high-risk vulnerable child investigation report 04/86720/22 that I advised that AR did not consent to his information being shared. I will have selected this option because AR did not speak to me so therefore had not given consent. I also note that I recorded that AR's mother did provide consent to share

information. I do not recall talking to her but I must have obtained consent before doing so.

24. At the time I will have been aware that a Risk Assessment involved consideration of past, present and potential future risks and that I should provide a rationale for the grading. I will also have been aware that high risk applied where there is evidence that a person is or has been subject to significant harm. I was aware that a high-risk vulnerable child investigation would be reviewed by the MASH the next day. I recorded this as a high-risk vulnerable child investigation because I wanted the family to get help or support quickly, given that the family appeared to be struggling and based on what AR's father had told me. I appreciated Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub ("MASH") re-assess the risk when they read the report.

25. At 07:20 on 14 May 2022, as noted on the investigation enquiry log, I asked for the referral to be closed once shared with the relevant agencies. There was no need for the report to come back to me once it had been shared by the MASH as I formed the view there was no further role for the Police.

26. I note that subsequently Safeguarding Support Officer ("SSO") 11913 Patel reduced it to medium risk on the same day and shared it with other agencies. SSO Patel shared the information on a Safeguarding Referral Form with a unique reference number of 04/86720/22. I exhibit the Safeguarding Referral Form 04/86720/22 (LC-86) as **PA/08 –**
LANC000094

27. I have been asked whether I was aware when tasked to deal with this incident that AR had previously (in October 2019) admitted to taking a knife into a school in order to stab someone, said he was 'pretty certain' to use it, and made reference to teachers getting murdered (LANC000041/LC-041). I was not aware of this.

28. I have been asked whether I was aware AR had previously been convicted (in 2020) for possession of a bladed article, possession of an offensive weapon, and assault occasioning actual bodily harm following an incident in December 2019 where he took weapons including a knife into his former school and assaulted a pupil. I was not aware of this.

29. I have been asked whether I was aware that AR's parents had called police on 5 November 2021 as a result of his violent behaviour inside the home, which led to a medium-risk PVP

referral being made; and then again on 30 November 2021, which led to a further PVP referral being made and a crime report taken for assault and criminal damage. I was not aware of this.

30. I have been asked whether I was aware that on 17 March 2022, AR had been found in possession of a knife on a bus, had said that he wanted to 'stab someone', and had referred to previously making, or an interest in, poison. I was not aware of this.

31. I have been asked whether I was aware that, as at 14 May 2022, AR had been referred to Prevent on three occasions (5 December 2019, by a teacher at his then-school, in relation to exclusion from prior school for carrying a knife and searching for mass school shootings on the internet; 1 January 2021, by a teacher at his previous school, as a result of concerning posts on social media; 26 April 2021, by a teacher at his then-school, as a result of internet searches for 'London Bomb' and his interest in the Israel/Palestine conflict, MI5, and the IRA). I was not aware of this.

32. I have been asked whether I consider that I ought to have been made aware of any or all of those matters to assist me in responding to this incident.

33. I could have read the 17 March 2022 incident log on my Samsung Smartphone. At 04:29 on that incident log it was recorded that there had been a missing from home report where AR was located on a bus in possession of a knife with thoughts of committing a serious offence in order to be arrested. This information was added to the log just before I was allocated to the incident. Because I was attending a 999 call and officers have only 15 minutes to arrive at such an incident, I think in accordance with my usual practice I will have just gone straight to the scene and not reviewed the log. In an ideal world I would have known about all the previous issues, but in the reality, Response officers cannot really pick all of this up whilst responding to a 999 call. It was not proportionate to stop at the roadside and complete several background checks.

34. I have been asked whether, overall, I consider that I was provided with adequate information to respond appropriately to the call on 14 May 2022, and whether any of my decision-making would or should have been different had I had additional information (and if so, how). Firstly, I think I had adequate information to respond to the call. Secondly, my decision making to make a high-risk referral would have been no different even if I had known of the previous matters, though I suppose I would then have had even more justification for classifying this as a high risk referral.

35. I have been asked what I expected to be the result of the vulnerable child report/Op Encompass referral that I submitted. I expected the information that I put on the vulnerable child report to be shared with other, more appropriate, agencies so that they could provide support to the family.

36. I have been asked whether, having regard to the Inquiry's Terms of Reference and the expectation on all witnesses to give a candid account, there are any other relevant matters that I wish to draw to the Chair's attention. There is nothing else that I would like to bring to the Chair's attention.

INVOLVEMENT WITH OTHER AGENCIES

37. I have been asked, insofar as I was involved with other relevant agencies, about my reflection on my dealing with them in relation to the events under investigation. I have been asked to address matters such: as any joint working arrangements; information sharing and the effectiveness of communication; and the degree of openness between agencies. I did not have any involvement with other agencies in this incident. My only involvement was to create the high-risk vulnerable child investigation report so that the MASH could share it with other agencies.

REFLECTION ON EVENTS

38. I have been asked whether, on reflection, I consider that (a) I and (b) Lancashire Constabulary could have done more or done things differently as regards my involvement with AR. I have been asked to address this both with the knowledge that I had at the time and, if different, now with the benefit of hindsight and/or wider understanding of the events. I don't think I could have done much differently: I did what I could to achieve a quick assessment from the MASH and for it to be shared with other, more appropriate agencies. I knew that if I inputted the investigation as high risk that MASH would look at it first thing in the morning. I was an Immediate Response officer at the time and from that perspective I feel I did all that I reasonably could and submitted the relevant referral.

39. I have been asked whether I consider that the (a) guidance; (b) training; and (c) resources available to me were adequate for the nature of the involvement I had in the events under investigation? I have been asked to address this both with the knowledge that I had at the

time and, if different, now with the benefit of hindsight and/or wider understanding of the events. I consider that my guidance, training and resources were adequate.

IMPROVEMENTS

40. I have been asked whether I am aware of relevant improvements that have been made by Lancashire Constabulary since these events. I am not aware of any relevant improvements.

41. The Chair is tasked with making recommendations but ensuring, through engagement with relevant practitioners, the recommendations are practicable. I have been asked to set out any improvements that could be made relevant to my own area of involvement that would be practicable and make an effective difference. I have no recommendations that I wish to make.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true. I understand that proceedings 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.

Sign: **Signature** PC 275 Andrews

Dated: 31/07/25

Index to the Witness Statement of PETER ANDREWS

Exhibit No.	Inquiry reference No.	Document description
PA/01	LANC000047	Incident log LC-20220514-0219 dated 14 May 2022 (LC-81)
PA/02	LANC000048	Incident log LC-20220514-0226 dated 14 May 2022 (LC-82)
PA/03	LANC000430	Radio transmission of PC Franzoni and PC Andrews being deployed to the incident dated 14 May 2022 (LC-159)
PA/04	LANC000431	Radio transmission of PC Andrews querying PC Franzoni estimated time of arrival dated 14 May 2022 (LC-160)
PA/05	LANC000253	Pronto report 04/86720/22 dated 14 May 2022 (LC-192)
PA/06	LANC000093	High-risk vulnerable child investigation 04/86720/22 dated 14 May 2022 (LC-85)
PA/07	LANC000124	Op Encompass email sent to Lancashire County Council dated 14 May 2022 (LC-119)
PA/08	LANC000094	Safeguarding Referral Form 04/86720/22 dated 14 May 2022 (LC-86)