Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 26/07/2025 10:41 PM from Dr Mohamad Al-Jeboori.

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 Mohamad Al-Jeboori
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 - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	Objection to Planning Application AWDM/0858/25 - 1 Monks Avenue, Lancing BN15 9DJ Dear Sir/Madam, I am writing to formally object to the proposed two-storey side extension at 1 Monks Avenue (planning reference AWDM/0858/25), on the grounds of privacy loss and reduction in natural light to my property, which sits directly behind the proposed development on the opposite corner of Monks Avenue and Grinstead Lane. It is important to note that this latest submission closely resembles the previously refused application (AWDM/1637/23), with only minor modifications that do not substantially mitigate its impact on neighbouring properties. The core concerns-privacy intrusion, overbearing massing, and reduced daylight-remain largely unresolved. The elevated extension introduces an upper level that may incorporate side- and

rear-facing windows. These features risk overlooking my home and garden, creating potential visual intrusion into habitable rooms and outdoor spaces. Given our lower building height and close proximity, the impact on privacy is considerable.

In addition, our south rear garden is the sole outdoor space available for leisure and seasonal enjoyment, particularly during summer months. The front garden, which is immediately adjacent to Grinstead Lane, is unsuitable for recreational use due to constant exposure to road traffic and pedestrian activity. Any loss of privacy or daylight to the rear area would therefore directly and disproportionately affect our quality of life.

Furthermore, due to the orientation and extent of the proposed two-storey structure, there are reasonable grounds to believe it will interfere with the natural daylight reaching our property, particularly in the early morning, by casting shadows toward our bungalow.

I ask the planning authority to carefully consider the cumulative impacts of this revised proposal, particularly in light of its similarity to the previously refused scheme, and to uphold the protection of neighbouring residential amenity.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Professor Mohamad Al-Jeboori