Dear Ms Scarisbrick,

Many thanks for taking my call to you of the 4th July. As freeholder of the adjoining building at No 14 South Hill Park, the basement of which is known as 11 Park End, I would like to make the following observations on the application for a change of use from office to residential:

1. I was unable to access the covering letter, referred to on page 2 of the application form, on the planning portal. I would be grateful if a copy could be made available.

2. Referring to drawing No 1/1, purporting to be the existing plan and section A-A, I believe this is seriously misleading:

a) The existing building includes a one space garage parking area, described on the plan as working area 2. This area has been in use as a garage area, unaltered from the original 1976 design, up to recently and to my knowledge has never been used as an office.

b) The garage is provided with laterally sliding access doors, adjacent to the pedestrian entrance, giving vehicular access from the mews over the apron area shown as a smart car space. The garage doors are not shown but are illustrated as a cranked solid wall. The garage is not provided with windows.

c) Unless recently formed, there is no opening between the working area 1 and the garage.

d) The car space shown is not existing as implied. It is not and has never been a viable parking space for even the smallest car and is the subject of an ongoing dispute with the adjoining occupiers of No 11 Park End as well as myself as freeholder. No vehicle can be parked in the space identified without encroaching on and obstructing; the vehicular entrance to No 11 together with the garage doors and the pedestrian access to No 12. A small car parked in this position partially blocks the entrance road to the mews, a mid range car or large vehicle could completely obstruct access to the mews.

I am most concerned that if planners accept the purported existing plan as an accurate record of the building, it will be used by the applicant or his successors to further a claim for established parking rights to the area shown. This communication is copied to neighbouring occupiers and representatives who I understand have experienced a long history of problems with the applicant's parking practices in the mews.

**Grounds for Objection:**

1. The garage offers a parking space in an area where there is strong demand leading to congestion and is needed to serve No 12, whether as an office or as residential. It should be retained as an amenity and to eliminate parking obstructions to the mews entrance and to No 11.

2. The application should be rejected as drawings are misleading. The parking space shown should be struck out as inviable and misleading. The garage should be shown as existing.

3. The close proximity of vehicles parked in the space shown seriously diminish the light penetration into the bedroom window of 11 Park End, exhaust fumes and soot cause pollution into the underground room and damage the window amenity.

4. The building is one of the few viable office units with garage parking in the immediate area and should be retained as an employment asset serving the mixed use accommodation in the mews.

5. I understand the mews is liable to flooding, with implications for further residential development.

I would like to be present when you inspect the site and would be grateful if this could be arranged by contact with the writer.

With many thanks and best regards,
Paul Styles 17 Constantine Road,
London NW3 2LN