

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 November 2025 18:08
To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Objection – Cotham School CCTV Application (S62A/2025/0133)

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to **object strongly** to Cotham School's proposal for **eight CCTV poles and 24 high-resolution cameras** at Stoke Lodge (Ref: S62A/2025/0133). I live [REDACTED] and the proposal would cause **serious and unacceptable intrusion** into our home, garden, and private family life.

1. Extreme privacy intrusion into homes and children's bedrooms

Each pole contains **three 5-megapixel cameras**, giving **360° views** that will look directly into surrounding houses and gardens. This includes **my children's bedrooms**, play areas, and family spaces. The cameras are powerful enough to identify faces and activities well beyond the distances stated in the application.

2. Privacy "masking" cannot be trusted or enforced

The system relies on **manual operator-set masking**, which can be changed, bypassed, or reset after software updates. Residents cannot verify or enforce what is masked. The school previously installed **unlawful covert CCTV** at Stoke Lodge, so there is no basis for trust.

3. Night-vision capability will intensify intrusion

The contractor recommends adding **infra-red night vision**, which would allow cameras to see into homes at night, further harming residential privacy.

4. Inaccurate and unreliable application documents

Your notes and emails show **contradictory plans**, an arboricultural report describing a different scheme, incorrect statements about land use, and a failure to acknowledge **public rights of way** across the land.

5. Harm to historic parkland and public rights of way

Multiple poles sit in open historic landscape and near key features. At least one pole obstructs a **public right of way**, contrary to national PROW policy.

6. No safeguarding justification

The school uses the fields only for **short, supervised sessions**, and Ofsted does **not** require CCTV on detached playing fields. The scale of surveillance is **wholly disproportionate** for a low-crime residential area.

Conclusion

This proposal represents a **major violation of residential privacy**, especially for families and children living beside the field. The surveillance is excessive, intrusive, and unjustified.

I therefore ask the Inspectorate to **refuse the application in full**.

Yours faithfully,

Cheuk Chuen She
[REDACTED]