

STATEMENT OF WITNESS*(Criminal Procedure Rules, r. 16.2; Criminal Justice Act 1967, s. 9)*

URN

--	--	--	--

Statement of: Constable Rachel Aldis

Age if under 18: Over 18

Occupation: Police officer

This statement 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.

Signature:



Date: 19 Jan 2026

I am the above-named Police Officer and I provide this statement in addition to my statement previously submitted to Camden Council dated 16 December 2025. I have been a Police Officer since January 2015 and am currently attached to the Licensing Team within the London Borough of Camden.

Summary

As outlined in my previous statement, the Metropolitan Police Service is seeking the revocation of the premises licence for Elysee, 13 Percy Street, London (Premises Licence PREM-LIC/1603). This application is made due to the premises' continued inability to comply with licence conditions, failure to work effectively with the Police, and failure to operate responsibly within the requirements of the Licensing Act 2003.

The Metropolitan Police strongly believe that this venue continues to pose a significant risk to the community, and in particular to women. Evidence has been obtained demonstrating repeated breaches of a number of licence conditions, despite the licensee having been advised by the Licensing Sub-Committee during a review hearing in 2022 that this represented their final chance.

Further Information Relating to the Premises

In addition to the crimes that occurred within the premises during November, police were made aware of a further allegation of violence against a woman, alleged to have occurred inside the premises in December.

It is alleged that while seated in the restaurant area of the premises, the victim's ex-partner placed his hands around her neck and was verbally abusive towards her. The victim has stated that she then left the premises via the front entrance, accompanied by a friend that was away from the table at the time of the offence. It is further alleged that the male suspect followed the victim outside the premises, where he shouted at her, verbally abused her, and spat at her.

The investigating officer was informed by the premises manager, Alex, that a security staff member employed by the premises, named Chris, approached both the victim and the suspect outside and challenged the suspect, stating that he must not speak to the victim in that manner. The victim then re-entered the premises, and the suspect attempted to follow her back inside.

Despite the seriousness of this incident, police were not contacted by the premises at any stage. Both the victim and the suspect subsequently left the premises. Further criminal incidents were committed against the victim and her friend a short distance away from the venue. Police attended those incidents, and the suspect was arrested for all offences, including the offence alleged to have occurred inside the licensed premises.

Signature:



Signature Witnessed by:

Continuation of Statement of: Constable Rachel Aldis

An update from the investigating officer dated 21 December regarding the crime that took place on 21st December states:

“Manager Alex advised me by telephone at 21:28 that the table at which the suspect and victim were seated is just outside the view of the CCTV cameras. Footage shows them moving in and out of view, and a verbal argument appears to take place. At present, Alex has stated that from what he has viewed on his phone, no direct footage of an assault has been captured by Elysee’s CCTV system.”

Additional Licensing Breaches

Condition 24 of the premises licence states:

24. Police must be called to incidents of violence and/or disorder.

Condition 75 of the premises licence states:

75. Door supervisors are to use body worn cameras. In the event of an incident, the footage must be made available to Police upon request. The venue will ensure that a suitable, expeditious playback/ downloading system is in place for Police to be able to obtain any evidential footage.

Condition 82 of the premises licence states:

“The CCTV system shall be maintained in good working order and at all times the premises is open to the public, be fully operational covering both internal and external areas of the premises to which the public have access.”

Condition 88 of the premises licence states:

88. Copies shall be made available within 48 hours to the Police or an authorised officer of the Licensing Authority, upon request.

On 22 December, I requested one hour of CCTV footage from all internal and external cameras at the premises to enable a thorough licensing investigation into this allegation. I specifically requested footage from all cameras in order to review the full interactions between the victim, the victim’s friend, the suspect, and any staff or security present. I offered to provide secure digital upload links to facilitate this request.

The following day, staff from the premises delivered CCTV footage to Kentish Town Police Station. The footage provided was inadequate and consisted of only one internal camera showing the entrance and two external cameras covering the front of the premises. I subsequently emailed the premises to explain that insufficient footage had been supplied and requested that footage from all areas be provided, emphasising the importance of internal coverage in order to identify any assault occurring inside the premises.

Taking into account the New Year period, the premises were given an additional six days to supply the footage. On New Year’s Eve, PC Gomez returned the CCTV storage device to the venue during a visit. I was later informed that on Monday 5 January, further CCTV footage, including footage from first-floor cameras, had been left at Kentish Town Police Station.

However, on examination, no footage could be accessed from the storage device provided. The device was submitted to the Metropolitan Police IT Service Desk, who confirmed that the footage could not be viewed. The device was then taken to the specialist CCTV unit at Kentish Town, who also confirmed that no CCTV footage was accessible on the device.

On Friday 9 January, I emailed the premises and their legal representative to advise that the device provided contained no viewable footage. I offered to attend the premises with a brand-new 64GB USB storage device in order to obtain this essential CCTV evidence. I received an email 7 days later from the venues legal representative asking if the footage could be dropped off in another 10 day’s time. I offered again to drop a USB stick to the venue and received a reply asking for a link to evidence.com to be sent to them so they could upload the footage electronically. This is what the Police asked the venue to assist in doing 25 days ago. I have since received 86 CCTV clips from the premises submitted on evidence.com.

The overall standard of the system appears to be inadequate. In particular, the low resolution imagery and insufficient lighting in several areas of the premises make it extremely difficult to identify individuals. As such,

Witness Signature: 

Signature Witnessed by:

Continuation of Statement of: Constable Rachel Aldis

the material provided is not of evidential quality. Additionally, the majority of the footage does not display any time or date information. The absence of this data presents further evidential difficulties and renders the recordings non compliant with licensing conditions. This is a further breach of conditions 82 and 86 on the premises licence.

PC Gomez has since provided a statement as supplementary data for this review following a visit he conducted at the premises on New Years Eve with PC Naish and Camden Council worker, Steven Dormer. In PC Gomez MG11 he states "I asked to see the cameras that were covering us at that moment and the rest of the restaurant and it was immediately clear that the restaurant floor had a significant blind spot. As you walk into the restaurant and turn right, the first table is there and this is captured by CCTV but everything after it is in a blind spot which goes on until the rear of the restaurant floor where the few tables in the back are covered as well as the small area they had for the live band."

At no point during the preceding 25 days, despite repeated requests for CCTV footage, did the premises inform me that there were blind spots or that CCTV coverage did not include the area of the incident. At no stage was it stated that the relevant offence would not be captured due to a lack of coverage.

On 6 December, I had sent an email to the premises requesting confirmation that the CCTV system was fully operational and covering all areas where licensable activities take place. This email was sent due to previous issues where the CCTV system had been broken. I did not receive any confirmation that CCTV coverage extended to all required areas.

Subsequently, on 10 December, during a meeting with the premises, Police clearly explained the CCTV licence condition, specifically that all areas of the premises should be adequately covered by CCTV. Despite this, no disclosure was made at that meeting regarding any gaps or deficiencies in coverage.

Taken together, this demonstrates a continued failure by the premises to be transparent and cooperative with police enquiries. Despite multiple emails, telephone calls, and a formal meeting regarding their licence conditions, the premises have failed to identify or address clear breaches of those conditions. This lack of disclosure and ongoing non-compliance is particularly concerning given that the premises are currently subject to a licence review.

I requested body worn footage from this incident and in particular where the security member has approached the victim and suspect. The premises have stated that when the security went to turn on the body worn footage, the camera did not turn on. This is the second time within 2 months that the venue have failed to provide body worn footage following an incident.

Conclusion

The above demonstrates a clear breach of CCTV licence conditions, body worn footage conditions and a serious lack of cooperation with the Police. The premises have made dismissive and inappropriate comments regarding police actions, including assertions that officers are "brainwashed," engaged in a "fishing expedition," or "out to get them."

While the premises appear to present a superficial level of cooperation, the reality is that over a period exceeding three weeks, repeated attempts to obtain essential CCTV footage, particularly covering the ground-floor restaurant area have been unsuccessful. This footage is not only critical for licensing purposes, but is also vital to the ongoing criminal investigation.

The Metropolitan Police Service firmly believes that revocation of the premises licence remains the only appropriate and proportionate step to ensure public safety and to prevent crime and disorder. These failings continue to demonstrate fundamental issues in management, supervision, and compliance and there are no additional conditions that could be added to the licence to ensure that the premises are able to uphold the licensing objectives.

Accordingly, the Metropolitan Police seek the revocation of the premises licence in its entirety.

Witness Signature:



Signature Witnessed by: