Dear Karen,

Many thanks for yours today.

My comments on the covering letter from Daniel Rose, dated 29/5/14, enclosed with the application are:

1. Page 2 states ''the site accommodates 1 off-street parking space'': The site has no viable parking space other than the single space garage shown as 'working area 2'. The parking space shown on the plan is of insufficient length and width to accommodate a small car without completely blocking the pedestrian entrance to No 12 and/or obstructing the double gates to the vehicle entrance serving  No 11 by seriously encroaching on the adjoining property. The applicant does not have the adjoining owner's consent to park straddling the boundary with No 11. I have been associated with  the building at 11 Park End/14 South Hill Park since 1973 when employed by a local architect occupying the first floor, overlooking the rear. 11 Park end was then a basement workshop with access, as today, through the double gates off the mews. To my certain knowledge, the double gate opening to No 11 has existed long before my initial encounter with the building in 1973 and the recent parking practices of the applicant appear to be an attempt to remove that access by storing a small car - which is rarely moved or used despite the building being empty since 2012 - to establish parking rights.

2. The cycle stand as shown in the entrance lobby is likely to be an obstruction to the means of escape.

3. The summary states no external works are required: Area 2, on the proposed plan, is a car garage, without windows and is likely to require significant external alterations to meet daylight requirements as a habitable room.  The opening between areas 1 & 2, if existing as claimed, is a recent alteration.

As per my previous, I would be grateful if you would inform me when you propose to inspect the site as I would like to be present. Please let me know if this is not possible.

Best Regards,
Paul Styles