Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 26/07/2025 10:08 PM from Dr KAWTHER AL HELAL.

Application Summary

Address:	1 Monks Avenue Lancing West Sussex BN15 9DJ
Proposal:	First floor side extension
Case Officer:	Peter Barnett

Click for further information

Customer Details

Name:	Dr KAWTHER AL HELAL
Email:	
Address:	109 Grinstead Lane Lancing West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment
Comments:	Comment on Planning Application AWDM/0858/25 - 1 Monks Avenue, Lancing, BN15 9DJ I am writing to express my objection to the proposed side extension under planning application AWDM/0858/25, with particular reference to its comparison with the earlier refused scheme AWDM/1637/23. As a neighbour directly affected by this development, I wish to highlight that while the proposed application presents as a modified version of the previous plans, it retains several key characteristics that continue to raise concerns: Massing and Scale: The current design maintains a significant two-storey bulk extending toward the eastern boundary. This mirrors the previous scheme AWDM/1637/23, which was refused partly due to the visual impact and overbearing nature of the extension relative to surrounding dwellings, especially bungalows such as mine. The updated plans do little to mitigate this issue. Proximity and Layout: The eastern elevation continues to encroach toward the

shared corner with my property. The footprint appears only marginally different, and the lack of meaningful setback or tapering means the extension still presents a dominating presence when viewed from my garden and windows.

Overlooking and Privacy: The positioning of new first-floor windows along the rear and possibly side elevations introduces direct lines of sight into my private outdoor space and rear rooms, exacerbating privacy loss beyond that of the existing structure. These concerns were central to the previous refusal and remain unaddressed.

Light and Amenity: As a bungalow situated behind and to the east of the applicant's property, I rely on morning sunlight, which is likely to be obstructed by the increased building mass. The new proposals will result in a tangible loss of daylight and overshadowing, contrary to the spirit of the refused application.

In summary, despite superficial changes, the proposed extension replicates many of the shortcomings identified in the earlier scheme and continues to pose material harm to neighbouring amenity. I respectfully ask the Council to take these concerns into account and maintain consistency with its prior decision.