

From: [Neil Phillips](#)
To: [Section 62A Applications Non Major](#)
Subject: Objection to Planning Application 25/14649/PINS on Stoke Lodge
Date: 17 November 2025 10:13:19

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Planning Inspectorate

I am writing to object to the planning application **25/14649/PINS** for the installation of eight CCTV cameras mounted on 6-metre poles at Stoke Lodge, BS9 2BH.

1. Visual Impact and Heritage Harm

The proposed poles and cameras will be highly intrusive and wholly unsympathetic to the heritage parkland setting of Stoke Lodge. The site forms the historic grounds of a listed building. Installing eight industrial-style poles, each three times the height of the existing fence, will destroy the tranquil character of this important open space.

Cameras 4, 5, 6 and 8 are particularly harmful as they are positioned away from the edges and close to focal points such as the **Tree of Life sculpture** and areas where replacement trees are planned.

Previous applications for similar structures were refused due to detrimental impact on heritage and visual amenity. This proposal is far more extensive and therefore even more damaging.

The cumulative effect of eight poles and cameras will create a hostile, overdeveloped environment, contrary to **BCS21, DM17, DM26, DM27 and DM31** of the Bristol Local Plan and **Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990**.

2. Impact on Privacy and Amenity

The application seeks to monitor **100% of a 22-acre field, 100% of the time**, which is disproportionate and inappropriate for a community amenity space. This level of surveillance is unsettling and intrusive for local residents and families who use the parkland.

From my own property at [REDACTED] the proposed poles may be visible. The cameras may overlook the adjoining play area, creating an oppressive environment and threatening its continued use. The proposal conflicts with **policy BCS21**, which requires safeguarding the amenity of existing development.

3. Lack of Justification and Misleading Claims

The applicant has failed to demonstrate any genuine need for these installations:

The school already has six cameras on the pavilion and hut, yet claims eight more are required despite minimal use of the site (small groups for short periods, only during term time).

References to statutory safeguarding requirements are misleading. Ofsted guidance confirms there is **no requirement for perimeter fencing or CCTV coverage of detached playing fields**.

Crime data provided by the applicant is historic and largely irrelevant; BS9 has one of the lowest crime rates in Bristol, and no incidents have been reported since June 2020.

4. Planning Policy Conflict

The site is designated as **Important Open Space**, and policy DM17 states development will not be permitted unless ancillary to open space use. Continuous CCTV monitoring cannot be considered ancillary. No evidence has been provided to justify harm to heritage assets or demonstrate public benefit.

5. Additional Concerns

The applicant's lease prohibits the erection of new structures on the land.

No visual impact assessment or heritage appraisal has been provided, despite previous refusals requiring this information.

The proposed cabling route crosses a gas main easement where no works are permitted.

In summary, this proposal is unnecessary, visually harmful, intrusive, and contrary to planning policy. It will damage the heritage character of Stoke Lodge, undermine community amenity, and set a dangerous precedent for overdevelopment of important open space.

I respectfully request that the Planning Inspectorate **refuse this application**.

Yours faithfully,
Neil Phillips

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]