

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 December 2025 00:39
To: Section 62A Applications Non Major
<section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments on planning application

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

Comments from [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

I do not wish to make an oral submission if a hearing is arranged.

I live in [REDACTED] and the parkland at Stoke Lodge is an Important Open Space in the local community. My comments in response to the planning application for 8 CCTV towers are as follows

1) Cotham School is about 3 miles away from Stoke Lodge. Its lease of Stoke Lodge is 'subject to all existing rights and use of the property, including use by the community'. As a member of the local community, I walk across Stoke Lodge, often using the Public Right of Way (the PROW are on the site itself, not adjacent to the site as the applicant has incorrectly stated). The proposed cameras (8 poles, triple cameras, so 24 cameras in total) would tower over the Rights of Way, causing an obstructive and unsightly dominance in a historic parkland setting. Some members of the local community may feel uncomfortable about being watched to the extent that they avoid using the Important Open Space at all. This is understandable as it is not made clear from the application who would be monitoring the camera footage or what they would be doing with that information.

.
2) a further 24 CCTV cameras would be an intrusive, overbearing and unnecessary invasion of the scenery. Apart from the 6 CCTV cameras already in place, there are currently 3 CCTV compounds on the grass of the parkland, for which there is no planning consent, and these are intimidating and unsightly to walk near.

BS9 is one of the safest suburbs of Bristol and the parkland is cherished by its local community. The applicant's claims of extensive vandalism (to the fence) are exaggerated (for instance claiming that thousands of pounds of damage has been caused with several panels missing and gaps in the fence. In fact one fence panel appears to have been removed. This was reported to have taken place around the same time that Cotham School applied for additional CCTV).

3) the planning application does not include details of the Public Rights of Way. The recently erected fence (for which no planning permission was deemed necessary, despite it being nearly a mile long and in parts over 2m in height) actually blocks a Public Right of Way. If this area of fencing is to be subsequently removed to maintain the Public Right of Way, the application would be inaccurate and invalid. Proposed camera 5 also blocks a PROW.

4) secondary school children from Cotham School are accompanied to the site for P.E, supervised by staff during lessons and don't spend 'break time' at Stoke Lodge. They have used the shared land in this way for many years. Members of the community including much younger children, the elderly and the disabled, continue to use Stoke Lodge without the need for staff, fencing or CCTV.

Given the low crime rates in this suburban area of Bristol, the risk of abduction or attack is extremely low. The Department of Education and Ofsted have confirmed that there is no requirement for off-site playing fields to be fenced, let alone have CCTV monitors installed. The applicant's statement about a safeguarding requirement for fence and CCTV are untrue and misleading. Across the country, school children undertake sport in a variety of green sites without it having to be fenced in or have 100% CCTV coverage.

5) previous applications for CCTV at Stoke Lodge have been declined, but the current application is for many more CCTV poles and even more cameras compared to the previously declined application. 6 metre high poles each with three cameras attached are very obviously intrusive to the heritage parkland site, they would appear intimidating and hostile to anybody trying to appreciate the woodland, nature and space of Stoke Lodge. This is a non-designated heritage asset, being the grounds of a large country house. The applicant has failed to provide a visual portrayal of how the proposed CCTV poles and cameras would look.

The fact that the fence has been re-erected does not mean that further unsightly and unsympathetic development should be condoned.

5) Stoke Lodge is situated immediately adjacent to a residential area. The 100% view cameras would be intrusive for all dwellings adjacent to the parkland. This would include the (mainly elderly) residents in the bungalows adjacent to the pavilion. It would be reasonable to consider that a higher proportion of these residents may face barriers in voicing their concerns about the proposed CCTV installation (eg less likely to respond via email). On their behalf I wish to emphasize that CCTV cameras which can potentially see into neighbouring properties homes, including bedrooms and living areas, is highly intrusive and unsettling. It is not clear how the privacy of neighbouring

properties would be ensured. The capacity of these cameras to work effectively in the dark, using infra-red capabilities, adds to the risk of intrusion of neighbour's privacy.

Cotham School have failed to explain how they would carry out privacy screening (based on previous experience this is a cause for concern - for instance Cotham School previously undertook covert videoing at Stoke Lodge without permission- claiming the police had advised it, which was subsequently found to be inaccurate information. Another example includes Cotham School failing to consult with the community about the current application).

Neighbours would also have their view constantly intruded upon by 6 metre poles, cameras and ancillary equipment. This would be worse during winter when leaf coverage is reduced.

The scale of additional CCTV proposed, along with the harm to the parkland environment and invasion of privacy affecting local residents, are serious concerns of mine regarding Cotham School's planning application.