

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 02 December 2025 23:18

**To:** Section 62A Applications Non Major

<section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

**Subject:** S62A/2025/0133 Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene, Shirehampton, Bristol BS9 2BH

I wish to strongly protest to the planning application from Cotham School to erect CCTV cameras in the Stoke Lodge green area, behind Stoke Lodge.

(ref. S62A/2025/0133).

The reasons as cited in the planning application make assumptions about the area, the people and the need of the cameras for children.

The area;

This green area has been used by the community for decades. There are Public Rights of Way across it which were in existence before Cotham School was thought of. It is quite shameful that Cotham school are suggesting that the community needs to be 'watched', and shocking to suggest that it is necessary for the safety of the children. Refer to crime statistics for this area.

The School.

Cotham School has made many statements which are untrue. There is no legal imperative for cameras to be there to protect the children. OFSTED does not require this. The Public Rights of Way cannot be challenged by them, as they are upheld by BCC. They do not own this land, they lease it, and in that lease it states that it should continue to be used by the community, and that the School should undertake that this need is met. It is bad behaviour on their part aside from being immoral and breaking the terms of the lease not to do this. There is, because of their behaviour an undercurrent of distrust. The veracity of statements made on both sides can easily be checked by looking at the published papers on this issue.

Vandalism;

The only vandalism that has occurred of late is the erecting of a fence to surround the green area by Cotham School. This fenced green area is far larger than that used by the School for games. It has been placed far too near the trees, and leaves no space round the outside for anyone to walk, and certainly no wheelchair access has been thought of. It is ugly and does not lend itself to fit in with the open space. This action is also totally disproportionate to their claims of vandalism. A few nuts and bolts missing is all that can be seen, and there could be many reasons for this.

The trees;

In the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan much emphasis is placed upon hiring the correct people - Tree surgeons, following the legal framework for

digging round the trees, and the way the trees will not have 'significant damage' caused to them. It is quite obvious that any digging in any route of underground shape will damage the area. As it is stated in the above report-

*"A tree that has taken many decades to reach maturity can be irreparably damaged in just a few minutes by unwitting or negligent actions".*

If there is a 'route' round the roots, how and where will that go? How much of the area will need to be dug up in order for these cameras to be put up? The footings will need to be 1.1m x 1.1m. That is a large area of concrete, add to that the wiring, and suggested IR lighting which needs special cabling. One cannot think that 'no significant' damage will be caused by this work. The poles on which the cameras will be sited will also be ugly and not in sympathy of the surroundings, even if they are painted green!

The cameras:

The height of the poles allowing the areas surveyed would overlook a great deal of people's private gardens, and will be able to see into people's private residences. It is said that areas of 'privacy' can be drawn and blocked out, that the residents should be shown the footage to make sure their privacy has not been taken away. Who would police this? How often would this be done? If there is an upgrade, or even a power cut how do we know that the cameras do not 'reset' back to seeing everything? How does a camera 'looking' even if blindly into your garden and house make a resident feel? There is an issue for the mental health of those having a camera peering over the wall. The area at present provides a glorious open space to walk, breathe and just be. How can that happen when anyone attempting to have some quiet time is being watched and recorded? One or two cameras would be intrusive, the number suggested is an unbelievable disproportionate misuse of assumed power.

The information;

In this culture at present in the West there is a great deal of worry about data. We have data protection, we need to agree to all elements of information being recorded online and social media can swiftly disseminate any footage to a huge number of people. In the case of the recordings - who would these videos be sent to? Who would be watching the community? How easy is it to access these pictures and send out on social media, or make generally available?

Other areas that have playing fields on them.

There are many sites in Bristol where open green areas are shared by communities and schools. How is this area so different from the rest? There are no CCTV cameras on other sites - we do not have CCTV cameras over the Downs. How many groups of people continuously throughout the week, and using all the space available share this green space? People, animals both domestic and wild use green areas all over Bristol. It is important that children understand the need for green spaces, for green spaces that continue to protect and nurture nature, trees, animals, birds. It is not beneficial for children to be locked away, nor made to feel that it is necessary to be behind walls and fences to feel safe. Nor is it beneficial that children feel they have a superior right over the needs of others and the community as a whole.

This is an outrage and I appeal to the common sense of the Planning Committee to check the facts, the statements of need by the School, look at the statistics for crime in

the area, and be cognisant of the change that these cameras would bring to the detriment of the whole community.



I do not wish to make an oral submission.