

**From:** Charlotte Dexter  
**Sent:** 07 October 2022 15:10  
**To:** Licensing HF  
**Subject:** Supplementary item 2022/00806/LAPR - 'CD' response to 5 Aug 2022 email from Kenny Wilkins to LBHF Licensing Authority

Date: 7 October 2022

Dear Licensing Authority and dear Sub-Committee,

Reference: 5 Aug 2022 email from Kenny Wilkins to LBHF Licensing Authority 2022/00806/LAPR - Premises: Pepe's Peri Peri 607 Fulham Road London SW6 5UA;

I submit this as part of Supplementary items being sent today to the Licensing Authority.

I have now read through the 68-page AGENDA for the Pepe's Peri Chicken Application 2022/00806/LAPR to extend hours to 4am.

I note for the first time (this was not sent to me previously) on the last page of the Agenda pack, page 68, that the agent, Kenny Wilkins, wrote the following in an email of 5 Aug 2022 to the Licensing Authority:

*"From: Kenny Wilkins*

*"Sent: 05 August 2022 15:49*

*"To: Licensing HF: H&F Subject: Fwd: Objections received - Reference: 2022/00806/LAPR - Premises: Pepe's Peri Peri 607 Fulham Road London SW6 5UA*

*"Dear Sir My response to the first attached is as follows. Many thanks. With all due respect. The comments by CD on my client's application are bothering on personal defamation. My client is a respectable man in society who would never speak on such derogatory terms about his business of which he has other branches and tries to serve his community with good quality food. My client KM has also never spoken to CD as claimed on her statement.*

*"Yours faithfully  
Kenny Wilkins"*

I, Charlotte Dexter, would like to say that there seems to be some confusion (which I would like to clear up) from the Applicant's agent about whether I, Charlotte Dexter ("CD") met with a person whom I thought was the Applicant/manager of the Premises, whose name I was told by my neighbour is Mohammed Shabbir.

I would like to make clear to the Sub-Committee that I met with Mohammed on Wednesday, 15th June, at approximately 3/3:30pm.—it might have been closer to 4pm.

I realise now, looking more closely at the 12-page Application (dated at top of page 1 as 'amended on the 01/06/2022'), that Kashif Mahmood is the Applicant. I am unclear if Kashif Mahmood and Mohammed Shabbir are the same person or two different persons, as from my experience, sometimes people have many given names as well as different or double surnames. If this is my possible confusion, then I apologise for this possible confusion. Perhaps it might be appropriate and informative to ask the Applicant or the Applicant's agent if they are able to shed any light on this matter and, indeed, if they can explain who Mohammed Shabbir is, what connection he is to them or the Applicant's business and how long they have known him?

In any case, because my neighbour had already spoken to him on or about 7 June, and had sent me a WhatsApp on 7 June at 09:40 with the name of the manager as Mohammed Shabbir, I walked into the Peri Chicken shop at 607 Fulham Road on 15 June sometime between 3-4pm and asked for the

manager. He was on site and was kind enough to speak with me and suggested that we sit down right there at one of the clean tables, specifically in the middle, not to the side wall, to discuss things.

I told Mohammed Shabbir that I had seen that he was applying for longer hours etc. He knew all about the Application, and in light of these facts and circumstances I believe that I was at the time entitled to consider that he was either the Applicant or someone who was well-informed about the Application and close to the Applicant. He both held himself out to me to be the manager of the business and someone with authority to discuss the Application. At no point did he dis-abuse me of this impression. Obviously, I cannot be responsible if those on the premises actively engage with me in detail about the Application (even if they are not authorised to do so by the Applicant and/or their employer). I acknowledge that with the benefit of hindsight I maybe should have double-checked or verified exactly who it was I was talking to but as he encouraged me to have the conversation and willingly offered to discuss the matter, I believe that none of the assumptions that I made at the time were unreasonable in the circumstances. If they are proved to be wrong then again I apologise. However, one might have expected the Applicant to brief their employees or team on the way to deal with anyone making reasonable enquiries about the Application at least to the point where they could have directed me to the Applicant or the agent. This did not happen.

Understandably, at that point I thought that he was the Applicant as well as the manager. He said he had also been visited by someone else. I said that might have been my neighbour, a male (for anonymity reasons I am not mentioning my neighbour's name here).

I have explained the conversation, which lasted about 15-20 minutes, in various detail in my initial Representation of 26 June (made via the comment form online) and subsequent email correspondence to the Licensing Authority on 15 July (email), 29 July (email) as well as 08 July (email)—all in the Agenda Pack here for this hearing.

After meeting with the manager, on the same day, Wednesday, 15th June, at 17:04, I subsequently wrote a WhatsApp to one of my neighbours telling that neighbour, in short, about this in-person conversation with Mohammed Shabbir. Please let me know if you need a screen grab of that dated/time stamped WhatsApp of 15 June 17:04.

I reserve the position that, once the identity of Mohammed Shabbir is clarified by the Applicant/their agent, it may be the case that his feedback given to me during our conversation may remain both pertinent and relevant to the Application. The word "defamation" is too easily and loosely used but in this case, I absolutely refute and deny any such assertion or implication in the circumstances of the Application because:

- 1 the statements made by me do not cause others to think less of the Applicant – after all he is a businessman making a business decision to apply for a licence the process for which relies on open and honest assessment of the facts and the merits of which will be conscientiously weighed and balanced by the Sub-Committee against publicly available criteria none of which require the assessment of the personal qualities of the Applicant; and
- 2 in absolutely no way whatsoever can it be said that the statements caused serious harm to the Applicant's reputation or are likely to. What is "up for grabs" here is the quality of the Application as it relates to the promotion of the four licensing objectives set out in the 2003 Act, not a debate (nor a distraction) about the person making them.

If something is bordering on defamation (which I assume is what Mr Wilkins meant to write) then by definition that very statement implies that what has been said is not defamatory and, therefore, this entire side-show is of no consequence to the Application and should be ignored. Leaving aside the quality of the food the issues here relate to how the Applicant considers, anticipates, acknowledges and serves the Community when it comes to the far more serious matters of crime, disorder, noise and nuisance which his neighbours are so deeply concerned about.

Thank you for allowing me to clarify these points to the Licensing Sub-Committee.  
Sent by email, as Signed: Charlotte Dexter