

**Minutes of the Meeting of the LICENSING (HEARING) SUB-COMMITTEE held at the Council Chamber, Epsom Town Hall on 7 January 2026**

---

**PRESENT -**

Councillors Neil Dallen, Humphrey Reynolds and Clive Woodbridge

In Attendance: Ali Hassan (Applicant Representative), Shakiel Younis (Applicant Representative)

Officers present: Kate Gillman (Solicitor), Paul Holliday (Principal Licensing Officer), Dan Clackson (Democratic Services Officer) and Angela Guest (online) (Democratic Services Officer)

---

**7 APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR**

The Sub-Committee unanimously agreed that Councillor Neil Dallen be appointed as Chair of the meeting.

**8 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of any disclosable pecuniary interests or other registrable or non-registrable interests were made by Members in response of any items considered at the meeting.

**9 DETERMINATION OF APPLICATION FOR PREMISES LICENCE**

The Sub-Committee received a report to determine an application for a premises licence for 182 Kingston Road, Epsom KT19 0SF, and where the authority had received relevant representation.

The Principal Licensing Officer introduced the report. Within his introduction he stated the following:

- a) He stated that the hours requested within the application was for serving refreshments both indoors and outdoors from 11pm to 1am on Sunday to Thursday and until 1.30am on Fridays and Saturdays as well as Christmas and New Year's Eve.
- b) Page 31 of the agenda pack shows the applicant's proposals for promoting the licencing objectives and these would be made into enforceable conditions if application was granted.
- c) One objection had been received and although the objector was not in attendance the sub-committee must consider this objection in their deliberations.

- d) The Applicant had submitted further evidence following agenda publication which had been shared with the sub-committee. This included a letter of support from a local resident and because this had been received outside of the timescale for representations the supporter had not been invited to speak today.
- e) The Applicant has confirmed they would provide a food delivery service using their own drivers. The Applicant had also confirmed that the seating area as shown on plans would be used for waiting customers as well as drivers waiting for deliveries.

The Sub-Committee invited other parties to ask questions of the Principal Licensing Officer.

- a) No parties had any questions to ask of the Principal Licensing Officer.

The Sub-Committee asked questions of the Principal Licensing Officer.

- a) The sub-committee asked if there had been any formal complaints of noise or disturbance in that area. It was confirmed that neither Licensing nor Environmental Health had received any complaints against the premises.
- b) The sub-committee asked for clarification on the outdoors provision. It was confirmed that this was a takeaway and outdoors related to the delivery service only. No provision was made for eating indoors or outdoors.

The Sub-Committee invited the Applicant to make an opening submission. The Licensing Consultant (Applicant's representative) provided an opening submission on behalf of the Applicant.

- a) The Applicant's representative explained that Pizza GoGo which is located beside this premises had a late license. He also stated that a letter of support from the resident above the premises was submitted and could not understand why the other resident had objected.

The Licensing Consultant responded to questions and comments from the Sub-Committee on behalf of the Applicant.

- a) There were no questions from the sub-committee to the Applicant's Representative.

The Sub-Committee invited other parties to ask questions of the Applicant.

- a) There were no other parties.

The Licensing Consultant responded to questions from the Sub-Committee's Legal Advisor on behalf of the applicant:

- a) In respect of the objector's statement of a noisy fan and noisy youths outside the Licensing Consultant confirmed that there was little noise from this premises, and the resident upstairs had not indicated this was an issue. He also stated that a food hygiene rating inspection had recently taken place, and all the equipment was working fine.

The Licensing Consultant responded to questions from the Sub-Committee on behalf of the Applicant:

- a) The Licensing Consultant confirmed that the CCTV was filming inside the premises only and not outside.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 and the Sub-Committee retired from the Council Chamber with their Legal Advisor to consider the application.

The Sub-Committee and their Legal Advisor returned to the Council Chamber and resumed the meeting at 11:37.

Having read the material presented in the agenda and all the written representations made, having listened to all the evidence and submissions presented at the hearing, and having regard to the Statutory Guidance and the Licensing Policy of the Council, the Sub-Committee has decided to grant the licence as applied for. The Chair explained the reasons for the decision as follows:

“We have received a letter from an objector and have noted their concerns. We note that we have received no objections from the responsible authorities and there have been no noise complaints recorded against the premises. The applicant has offered to address crime and disorder and nuisance objectives with notices and CCTV and has a contract with a waste company in place. We have also received a letter in support of the applicant which we have taken into account. We also note that the area is a busy dual carriageway with a number of businesses operating. We believe that the conditions proposed adequately address the licensing objectives and therefore grant the licence as applied for.”

The Chair advised that the decision of the Sub-Committee would be followed up by written confirmation of the decision in due course and advised that the Applicant and representors had a right of appeal against the decision of the Sub-Committee, within 21 days of the notification in writing to the Applicant, to the Magistrates Court.

*The meeting began at 11.04am, was adjourned between 11.20am -11.37am, and ended at 11.38am.*