

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

PRESENT -

Councillors Steve Bridger, Humphrey Reynolds and Clive Woodbridge

In Attendance: Eminie Fezal Yurdakul (Applicant's Representative) Bilal Nadir Gilgiel (Applicant), Bilal Gilgiel, Jenny Billam (Police Licensing Officer) and Edward Elton (Legal Representative for Surrey Police)

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

10 APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR

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

11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

12 VARIATION OF LATE NIGHT REFRESHMENT LICENCE

The Sub-Committee received a report to determine an application to vary a premises licence for Epsom Grill, 3 Waterloo Road, Epsom KT19 8AY where the authority had received relevant representation.

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

- a) That the measures proposed by the Applicant to promote the four licensing objectives will be converted into enforceable conditions on the license if granted and unless the sub-committee make any changes.

- b) Paragraph 2.7 of page 7 had been amended to say **no** reports or records of complaints in respect of the above events.
- c) Paragraph 3.2 of page 7 had been amended to 11 December **2026** rather than 2025.

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

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

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

- e) The Sub-Committee had no questions at this time.

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.

- f) Epsom Grill had been trading several years, was a takeaway service and did not deal with alcohol and were seeking a variation of operating hours on Friday and Saturday nights until 4am.
- g) Several Temporary Events Notices (TENS) had been applied for in the past year to extend operating hours. Recently, 10 applications had been made for Christmas Day, Boxing Day and New Year's Eve which had no incidents and received no negative feedback from authorities. This showed the business acting responsibly and safely.
- h) Relying on TENS was not good for the business as it was difficult to plan in advance especially when they have short notice of events. The Applicant did not hold a personal licence so can only do two lates per year and this does not cover customer demand.
- i) During the application process the police registered a complaint citing concern about the crime rates in the town centre but confirmed that only a small number of incidences were directly linked to premises nearby. Therefore, Epsom Grill was not the main cause of crime or disorder. The police also cited that extended hours would contribute to people loitering in the area for longer periods but there was a club open not far from Epsom Grill that operated until 3am. Chicken Valley also operated until 2.30am. By allowing the application it would assist with dispersal of people as there would be multiple locations available rather than having them all at one venue.
- j) The Applicant was happy to employ one SI door supervisor on Friday's and Saturday's if the Committee thought this necessary. The Applicant

was also happy to accept strong conditions such as CCTV, incident logs litter picking and dispersal signage.

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

k) The Sub-Committee had no questions at this time.

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

- a) In response to a question regarding understanding the difference between the High Street, as the epicentre of nighttime activity and upper high street, the location of Chicken Valley, the Applicant's Representative responded that the Applicant was aware that it was only four or five minutes' walk which customers would do to get food.
- b) The Applicant's Representative confirmed that the Applicant was related to the landowner and that another relative was a previous license holder. The Applicant confirmed he had been the license holder since October 2024.

The Sub-Committee invited the Responsible Authorities to make an opening submission. The Legal Representative for Surrey Police provided an opening submission:

- l) Paragraph 5.7 was highlighted that explained the committee was not confined to the physical limits of the premises (Luminar and Wakefield Magistrate's Court 2008) but if reasonable to do so could consider the crime and disorder in relation to the areas outside of the Applicant's control and consider location and proximity of the premises to bars and nightclubs. It was the view of the police that in this case the wider limits should be considered.
- m) It was the police view that the licensing objectives would not be served by this premises operating until 3am or 4am on the busy nights applied for because it would provide a geographical focus for the post club/pub people. The offer of a free cup of tea and food would keep those people in the location of the red zone for longer than otherwise.
- n) The two licensing objectives of prevention of crime and disorder and prevention of nuisance are best served by people dispersing quickly when leaving clubs/pubs and having a geographical focus would do the opposite of that.
- o) On each of the TENS the Applicant had an SIA registered door supervisor and this is not guaranteed in this application. In the opinion of the police at least one SIA should be provided on each occasion.
- p) On 8 June 2025 there were three affrays in the immediate area of the premises but not on the premises. This was because the shop was a geographical magnet for people once pubs and clubs were shut.

- q) The Committee were urged to consider the requirements of premises in the coloured zones in testing this application and how it promotes the four licensing objectives and if this application missed several of those, then that should be cause for alarm as it would show the application was not given the required level of aforethought.
- r) The first sentence of the minute for a refusal on a previous application for another family member was read out and was considered to be the same reason for refusal in this case. This new application did not address 38 of the mandatory requirements under the red zone scheme and therefore could not promote the four licensing objectives and should be refused.

The Police Licensing Officer responded to questions from the Sub-Committee:

- s) It was accepted that the applicant had used some TENS to test out staying open until 4am it should be noted that these were in what the police regard as exceptional period of time such as Christmas and the Derby weekend when there would normally be extra police resources deployed.
- t) It was explained that this premises had a number of TENS that could be used and not just during busy periods only. If the premises had used TENS during normal periods this may have given a different opinion from the police.
- u) It was confirmed that there was objection to both the time of the application and the management. The extended opening time would stop people from just going home and there will be problems in the future because of this.
- v) It was confirmed that Uber reduce their prices from 4am which further compounded the police argument that people would hang around the premises waiting for prices to drop especially when food and refreshments were provided.

The Police Licensing Officer responded to questions from the Sub-Committee's Solicitor:

- w) It was confirmed that the conditions listed in the report would be in addition to the conditions already in place although it was noted that some were duplicated.
- x) Details of the 40 crimes recorded on Waterloo Road between 11pm and 5am from 25 December 2024 and 8 November 2025 were read out. The crimes were mostly affrays but there were also some sexual assaults. The five crimes directly associated with the premises were affrays.

The Police Licensing Officer responded to questions from the Applicant:

- y) The explanation from the Applicant regarding the number of TEN applications was noted. That they could not use all their allocation of TEN applications in one calendar year in case there were events coming up in the area. This meant applying was difficult to manage.
- z) It was also noted that application was not a new one but a variation of the present licence and that current conditions would apply as well as any new ones imposed. The Applicant was happy to employ an SIA door person on Fridays and Saturdays from hours of 11pm and 4am.
- aa) The police would investigate claims of Papa John's breaching their license.
- bb) Confirmation that the Applicant does not serve beverages as claimed by the Authorities was noted.

There were no closing statements.

The meeting was adjourned at 14:49 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 15:55.

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 made their decision, which was relayed by the Chair as follows:

"We have heard the evidence from the police in relation to the crime and disorder and nuisance concerns should this application for variation of licence conditions be granted. We are mindful that the local nightclub close at 3am and that the police are apprehensive about inebriated individuals congregating in an area which is associated with crime and anti-social behaviour. We have heard from the applicant that they have managed several TENS (Temporary Events Notice) in 2024 and 2025 without incident. This has been confirmed by the Licensing Officer. We as a Subcommittee do feel the licensing objectives of prevention of crime and disorder, and nuisance would be undermined should the premises open until 4am. However, our fears can be allayed, and the licensing objectives can be promoted by the imposition of the following reasonable and proportionate conditions:

1. Keep all existing conditions with the additional conditions below:
 - a. The licensable activities will cease at 3am on Fridays and Saturdays
 - b. The management and staff will ensure that the premises are vacated by the public by 3am
 - c. At least one SIA (Security Industry Authority) door staff employed every Friday and Saturday night from 11.30pm to 3.30am
 - d. The SIA security staff employed at the premises shall be responsible for maintaining order and minimising noise and anti-social behaviour to the front of the premises
 - e. Door staff will proactively encourage customers to leave the immediate area after being served."

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 2pm, was adjourned between 2.49pm -3.55pm, and ended at 3.59pm.

The meeting began at 2.00 pm and ended at 3.59 pm