

## APPENDIX M

**From:** Natasha Nunn [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 21, 2024 2:46 PM  
**To:** Heron, Andrew <Andrew.Heron@southwark.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** RE: Wazobia - 670 Old Kent Road - Premises Licence Review

Dear Mr Heron

We do not agree that this matter is to be re-advertised as the decision to remit is to hear the original application afresh and not to permit the matter to be re-advertised. Aside from the original representations then only fresh matters to be considered are those contained within the order of the magistrates court.

Upon re-hearing the licensing sub-committee determines the original application along with the representations made within the original 28 day period and whilst the magistrates court on appeal can give any directions as to the re-hearing, which are included with in the order of the District Judge, there is nothing in the order from the magistrates court allowing for the matter to be re-advertised.

We have sent a full email in this regard to Debra Allday, which I will forward under separate email to which we still await a response.

Kind regards

**Natasha Nunn**  
**Solicitor**  
**Dadds LLP Licensing Solicitors**

**From:** Natasha Nunn  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 18, 2024 2:30 PM  
**To:** Allday, Debra <[debra.allday@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:debra.allday@southwark.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** RE: re Wazobia

Dear Debra

Thank you for your email which I have discussed with David.

We are still of the opinion that this matter should not be readvertised and that there is no lawful basis on which to do so. Following an appeal, the remittal to the licensing sub-committee hearing is to redetermine the original application in accordance with any direction of the court.

Any remittal for re-hearing is permitting the LSC to hear the matter afresh and this does not in itself permit the application to be readvertised. The order of DJ Benjamin does not provide for any further advertising of the original application. Furthermore, the public when making a representation do not do so in response to additional evidence put forward by an Appellant/Applicant but make representations in response to an application for review, based on their own personal knowledge and the law is quite clear that such representations are to be made within a strict 28 day time frame of the date the application for review is submitted.

If the Appellant really wants to continue with advertising this review then the correct way forward would be to start afresh and withdraw this application and submit a new application for review. We cannot see any other lawful basis which would permit this original application for review to be readvertised and would challenge the legal basis of any representations made in response to this.

Kind regards

**Natasha Nunn**  
**Solicitor**  
**Dadds LLP Licensing Solicitors**