

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 01 December 2025 22:23

To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Subject: Objections to Application S62A/2025/0133) Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, Bristol BS9 2BH

TO PINS,

I am writing to formally object to the application by Cotham School to install eight CCTV cameras on 6m poles around Stoke Lodge Playing Fields (Ref: S62A/2025/0133) Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene, Shirehampton, Bristol BS9 2BH for the following reasons.

Invalid Application and Inaccuracies

The application documents contain significant inconsistencies regarding both the proposed locations for the cameras and the route of underground cabling. Material submitted, especially the arboricultural report, is not valid for this proposal due to reference to an incorrect cabling route. The site location plan's red line does not correspond to the actual lease boundary, thereby failing to include all affected land and required access points. This affects biodiversity calculations and undermines the validity of the entire submission.

Public Rights of Way Ignored

There are four established public rights of way within the site, not merely adjacent to it as indicated by the applicant. At least one proposed CCTV pole would obstruct one such right of way, and the application does not sufficiently address this. Planning guidance is clear that the impact on all affected rights of way must be thoroughly assessed and shown on submitted plans, which has not been done.

Community Use and Lack of Need

The fields are designated for community as well as school use, with the school's presence being minimal compared to the broader public. The school's assertion of necessity for 100% continuous CCTV for safeguarding is unfounded. Ofsted and the Department for Education do not require playing fields to be fenced or monitored with CCTV, and the area in question is already covered by several cameras. The risk context cited is disproportionate, with the BS9 area having one of Bristol's lowest crime rates.

Visual and Heritage Impact

The proposed CCTV poles would be highly intrusive, especially around notable parkland features and sightlines. Previous similar proposals have been refused for detrimental impact to the heritage character and setting of the listed Stoke Lodge building and parkland. The applicant's Heritage Statement is misleading; the land is indisputably of heritage value as recognized in historical assessments and court findings.

Loss of Privacy and Amenity

Continuous surveillance of such an expansive, shared public space is excessive and undermines its role as a valued community amenity. The proposal would erode the sense of openness and potentially discourage lawful public use, contrary to local planning policy BCS21 and national requirements for protection of amenity and privacy. The cameras, when positioned, due to their height, invade the privacy of dwellings around the entire site to the extent that they film directly into bedrooms, bathrooms and living spaces, let alone gardens. Also, they will be filming the play area, directly infringing the rights of families to privacy as well as exposing children to being

directly captured on film, totally unacceptable in terms of safeguarding their anonymity.

Policy Conflicts

The application conflicts with multiple planning policies intended to safeguard open space, landscape character, heritage assets, and public rights of way. The utilitarian design, scale, and unclear justification of the cameras compound the harm. No compelling public benefit or assessment of alternatives, or less intrusive security arrangements has been provided.

Lease and Utility Issues

The application fails to disclose that the school's lease prohibits new structures, and the cabling would cross protected gas easements, further calling into question the deliverability of the scheme.

Given these deficiencies and significant adverse impacts, this application must be refused in its entirety.

Yours faithfully,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature and name of the official.