

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Section 62A Applications Non Major](#)
Subject: Planning Objection - Application ref S62A/2025/0133 (Stoke Lodge Playing Fields) - Against
Date: 15 November 2025 13:20:17
Importance: High

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

To: Section 62A Applications Team, Planning Inspectorate

Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing to object to application S62A/2025/0133 concerning the installation of eight CCTV cameras on six metre poles at Stoke Lodge Playing Fields. (Stoke Lodge Sports Ground, Shirehampton Road, Sea Mills, Bristol, BS9 2BH).

1. Impact on my family's privacy and safeguarding

My family and I live immediately beside the site. We are a family of five with three teenage children. My most serious concern is the direct intrusion into the private life of my family. The proposed cameras are powerful, have full circle views and have enough detail to see clearly into the rear of our home. Our rear family garden would also be directly visible. This would change how safely and comfortably we can use our own outdoor space.

Camera 8 is of particular personal concern to my property because of the located positions shown in the plans but similar issues arise with the other cameras for other houses. From any of the possible positions given for Camera 8 the line of sight towards our home would allow observation of private rooms including our bathroom, our bedroom and our teenage daughter's bedroom. This creates obvious safeguarding concerns for my children and would affect how we live and how we feel every day.

The height of the poles makes this more severe. An elevated six metre structure allows views that cannot be screened or mitigated by fencing or planting. The impact is not limited to actual recording. The knowledge that a powerful camera is trained towards private family space affects how a home is used. This is a recognised planning issue where perceived surveillance harms the sense of privacy and residential amenity.

The applicant states that privacy masking will be used but the system relies entirely on correct configuration by the school. The operator always sees the unmasked picture before any masking is applied. The applicant does not explain who will maintain these settings over time or how they will be kept in place after updates or software changes. Residents have no way to check that masking is being used correctly. It is not reasonable to expect my family to accept a system that we cannot oversee even though it affects the most sensitive areas of our home. Protecting residential privacy is a core planning principle and the proposal does not do this.

2. Previous covert CCTV raises concerns about the operation of this system

I do not raise this as a historic complaint but as a material point about the enforceability of conditions. The school has previously installed covert CCTV on this land and was required to remove it. Given that history it is reasonable to question whether future assurances about privacy settings can be relied upon. The ability to operate the system in a way that protects resident privacy depends entirely on the behaviour and configuration choices of the operator. This makes it a real world concern that the Inspectorate can take into account.

3. Lack of any convincing need for eight poles or full site monitoring

I have lived beside the field for more than a decade and I am not aware of any pattern of

serious incidents that would justify constant surveillance of a twenty two acre site. The applicant's own incident schedule contains nothing after 2020. Pupils who use the field are always accompanied by staff and the school already has several cameras at the pavilion. National guidance does not require detached playing fields to have CCTV. The amount of surveillance proposed is disproportionate to any need. If allowed it would create new and unnecessary risks to the privacy and safety of families whose homes and gardens back onto the field. There is no evidence that the benefits claimed by the applicant outweigh these harms.

4. Impact on the wider community

The issue is not limited to private homes. The fields are used daily by the community and are valued as a peaceful and open place. Eight tall poles with surveillance equipment would change the nature of the space for everyone who uses it. Rights of way cross the land and many users including elderly residents and families with young children do not wish to be filmed during normal recreation. The proposal feels unnecessary because this is a low crime area with a strong record of community use. Heavy surveillance would discourage public use and undermine the purpose of the land as Important Open Space. The proposal is not ancillary to the use of the land as open space which is a key requirement of the planning policy that protects this type of site.

5. Visual and landscape impact

Stoke Lodge has a parkland quality that contributes to the enjoyment of the area. The proposed poles would rise far above the fence line and vegetation and would be noticeable from many viewpoints. Several poles, including the one closest to my home, sit in open areas and would be stark and out of place.

The applicant has provided no clear visual material to show how the structures would affect views from homes or across the landscape. The effect on the setting of the listed building and on the non-designated heritage landscape has not been assessed. The development would diminish the character and amenity of the site.

6. Public rights of way

Four claimed rights of way cross the land and these are awaiting determination by the Inspectorate. At least one of the proposed poles appears to obstruct a path. The application does not identify these routes or assess their amenity. National guidance requires applicants to show how development affects any public right of way across the land. This omission prevents a full assessment of the effect on public access and on the character of the paths.

The location of the new fence which the cameras are positioned against may change if the rights of way are confirmed. This makes the application premature because the layout on which the cameras depend may not remain in place.

7. Issues with completeness and clarity in the application

The application contains contradictions including different camera locations and different cabling routes. The red line boundary excludes areas that would clearly be affected by the development. A sound planning judgement cannot be made when the applicant's documents do not reliably show what is proposed.

Summary

In summary this proposal would cause serious harm to the privacy, wellbeing and safety of my family. It would allow views into private rooms including our bathroom and bedrooms and into our rear garden. It would alter the character of a valued community space and

create an environment dominated by surveillance in an area that does not need it. The design and scale of the poles would harm the landscape and parkland setting. The application does not deal properly with rights of way and is based on documents that are inconsistent and incomplete.

For all these reasons I ask the Inspectorate to refuse the application.

If permission were granted despite these concerns then it should be time limited and subject to strict conditions including regular ongoing independent verification that privacy masking is correctly set and in operation and a ban on infrared capability or additional equipment unless separately approved.

Yours faithfully,

Mr Christopher Law

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]