

From: Ian Woodward [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 November 2025 16:04
To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection to application reference number S62A/2025/0133

Dear Inspectorate,

Site Address:

Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene, Shirehampton, Bristol BS9 2BH.

Objection:

I wish to register a firm objection to the proposed CCTV cameras on the grounds that they would interfere with established public rights of way.

In response to Question 6, Cotham Academy states that there are several “claimed rights of way” located *adjacent* to the site. However, the application makes no attempt to address how the scheme would affect these routes. In reality, the four paths lie *within* the site itself, not beside it, and have already been approved by the Council as landowner. They are currently awaiting determination by the Planning Inspectorate (reference ROW/3363939). At least one of the proposed poles (camera 5, and potentially camera 4) would block a recognised right of way.

National planning policy on open space, recreation facilities and public rights of way—along with Defra’s Rights of Way Circular 1/09—sets out clear expectations for assessing development that interacts with rights of way. Paragraph 7.4 of Circular 1/09 requires that “all public rights of way crossing or adjoining the proposed development site must be marked on the plan submitted with a full planning application.” The applicant has not complied with this requirement. The same guidance also states that applicants must explain how their proposals may affect any rights of way, including claimed routes or paths not yet added to the definitive map, and that decision-makers must consider these impacts. As the submission stands, the Planning Inspectorate cannot properly evaluate this crucial aspect of the scheme. This is a significant planning consideration and should lead to refusal of the application.

The presence of these rights of way has direct implications for the siting of the fence and how the school is able to use the land. Should the Planning Inspectorate confirm the routes on the Definitive Map, the fence may need to be moved or removed entirely. This application is therefore (a) incomplete because it ignores the effect of the proposal on the claimed rights of way and the experience of those using them, and (b) premature, as the CCTV poles are positioned in relation to a fence that may not exist in the future. This uncertainty affects both the visual impact of the cameras and undermines the justification put forward for them.

Please reject this application unequivocally.

Presence at any hearing:

Should you decide that a hearing is necessary I would wish to speak at that hearing.

Best regards,
Ian Woodward

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Ian Woodward.