

From: Tim Lansley [REDACTED]
Date: 24 November 2024 at 13:50:49 GMT
To: section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: No 24/03843/PINS

Dear Sirs,

Application No.24/03843/PINS. Installation of 3 no. CCTV poles and cameras.

We live [REDACTED]

We wish to object to the application identified above.

The position of camera no. 1 would harm the amenity of our house owing to the potential obstruction of the open views across the playing field from our kitchen side door and dining room window. This represents a conflict with policy BCS21.

Pole No. 1 as proposed would be approximately 3m from our boundary fence and 4.5 m from the kitchen door and dining room window. The CCTV camera would sit on top of a 4m pole, perhaps at eye level when viewed from the nearby kitchen door and dining room window.

We are of the view that owing to conflict with policy BCS 21, pole no. 1 should be re-positioned either further into the nearby top corner of the playing field where it would be hidden from the view from the dining room window or, alternatively, on the opposite corner of the playing field, where it would be screened from the adjacent house by existing vegetation.

The proposal would cause further harm to the character of the Conservation Area in representing the potential for further detracting from the 'openness' of the remaining green space. However, we acknowledge that this 'openness' benefit to the Conservation Area has been significantly reduced over the years by the encroachment of development on to the playing field required by the expansion of the school. This has been allowed by the local planning authority which, in our view, has allowed its planning responsibility to be a secondary consideration alongside its responsibility as the local education authority.

The proposal would bring some security benefits to the playing field and school as a whole, and in turn, to the houses adjacent to the playing field. We welcome these benefits. However, we also consider that these benefits may not be of great significance and would not make-up for any reduction in adult supervision of the playing field.

Any decision to allow the application should be conditioned to prevent the provision of supplementary lighting.

Yours faithfully

Tim and Julie Lansley