

I am writing to formally object to the amended planning application for 9 Riddiford Drive, Burgess Hill, RH15 8RJ, which now proposes a wall in place of the previously proposed fence as part of the enclosure of land that was originally intended to remain communal.

When I purchased my flat, one of the key features was the outlook over a shared open space with a mature tree at its centre. This area contributed significantly to the character of the development by providing visual openness, an attractive setting, and a sense of shared community for residents. It was an important communal amenity that formed part of the original design of the estate.

Unfortunately, the amended application does not address my original concerns. In particular:

- The proposed garden extension continues to enclose land that was originally communal, resulting in the permanent loss of shared outdoor space for residents.
- The mature tree remains a key feature of the development. Although it is healthy, enclosing the surrounding land within a private garden significantly reduces the public amenity and enjoyment that the tree and open space were intended to provide.
- My property now overlooks a substantially enlarged private garden rather than the communal open space that formed part of the original development, adversely affecting my outlook and enjoyment of my home.
- Replacing the previously proposed fence with a wall does not overcome the fundamental planning concerns. A solid wall creates an even more permanent and visually dominant enclosure, further eroding the open character of the development and reinforcing the private appropriation of land that was intended for the benefit of all residents.
- The proposed wall would create a more urban and enclosed appearance, which is out of keeping with the original design and layout of the estate.
- I was assured by the developers that the mature tree would be protected and that the communal area would not be enclosed. Those assurances have not been honoured,

further undermining confidence in the management and preservation of communal spaces.

- The enclosure of this land remains inconsistent with the original layout and character of the development, regardless of whether the boundary is formed by a fence or a wall.
- These changes have been pursued without meaningful consultation with residents, despite the significant and permanent loss of an important shared amenity.

I would also like to add that during the recent hot weather, this communal area has been an important place for residents of the flats to enjoy the outdoors. As someone living in a flat without a private garden, I have valued having access to this shared space. Its loss has significantly reduced the amenity available to residents.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Council to refuse this amended application. Simply replacing a fence with a wall does not address the principal planning issue: the continued enclosure and privatisation of communal land that was intended to remain open for the benefit of all residents. I ask that the Council seeks the restoration of the communal land and its original open character, ensuring that this important shared amenity is preserved.