

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 24 November 2025 18:47

To: Section 62A Applications Non Major

<section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Subject: Objection – S62A/2025/0133 – Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, BS9 2BH

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to planning application S62A/2025/0133 for eight 6-metre CCTV poles at Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene, Shirehampton, Bristol BS9 2BH.

I live close to the site and use this space regularly. I know the land extremely well, and the proposals bear no resemblance to what is actually needed or appropriate for this historic parkland. The scale of what is being proposed is excessive, unjustified, and deeply damaging to the character, amenity and openness of the fields.

1. The information submitted is inconsistent and unreliable

The documents contradict each other on the routes of the cabling and the exact locations of several poles. Even the red-line boundary is wrong and excludes trees and land that must be included. If the applicant cannot produce a basic accurate plan, the proposal cannot be properly assessed. Which I believe increases inconsistencies.

2. Public Rights of Way have been ignored

Four Public Rights of Way cross the fields — not “adjacent”, but across the land itself. The applicant has failed to map or assess them, despite mandatory Defra guidance. One pole (Camera 5) would physically obstruct a PROW, and Camera 4 may do the same.

As someone who uses these routes regularly, the idea of them being blocked or monitored by 6-metre surveillance poles is unacceptable and intrusive.

3. The land is not used the way the applicant claims

Cotham School barely uses the site. When they do, groups are small, stay briefly, and only occupy the top area. They already have six cameras covering that upper section. There is no credible justification for eight more.

Their claims about “safeguarding requirements” are misleading. Pupils are supervised at all times, and no regulation requires fencing or 100% CCTV coverage of detached playing fields. The application leans heavily on overstated language rather than evidence.

4. Crime prevention is a hollow argument

I live in ■■■, which is one of the lowest-crime areas in Bristol. The incidents the school relies on are years old — mostly from lockdown — and some were not crimes at all. There have been no recorded problems in recent years. The idea that 22 acres of open parkland require 24/7 surveillance is unreasonable.

5. The visual impact will be severe

This is historic parkland forming the setting of the Grade II listed Stoke Lodge. The mature trees, open sightlines and tranquil character define the space. Six-metre poles scattered across the landscape will completely undermine that character.

Cameras 4, 5, 6 and 8 are particularly intrusive. Camera 4 is within metres of the Tree of Life sculpture and the arboretum area — a completely inappropriate location for a metal surveillance structure.

6. The impact on privacy is unacceptable

I use the fields and the PROWs often. I do not want every movement recorded by the school, stored, and potentially reviewed later. This level of surveillance is oppressive in what is supposed to be shared public open space.

The school's past use of covert cameras — only removed after intervention from the ICO — gives me no confidence in promises about privacy screening or responsible use of CCTV.

7. Policy conflicts

The proposal conflicts with DM17, DM26, DM27, DM31, BCS21, BCS22, and the heritage duties under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. This is designated Important Open Space. Eight surveillance towers are not ancillary to open-space use and cannot be justified in this context.

8. Additional issues

The applicant's lease prohibits the erection of new structures. Their cabling route also crosses a protected gas easement where such works are not permitted.

Conclusion

This proposal is unnecessary, visually harmful, intrusive, based on unreliable information and fundamentally at odds with the character and purpose of this parkland. It would damage the setting of a listed building, undermine Public Rights of Way and turn a valued community space into an over-monitored, urbanised environment.

I ask that the application is refused.

I would like to be informed if a hearing is held.

Yours faithfully,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.