

**From:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 23 November 2025 09:44

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

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

**Section 62A Planning Application: S62A/2025/0133  
Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene,  
Shirehampton, Bristol BS9 2BH**

I wish to object to this proposal for 8 CCTV 6 m poles each with 3 cameras on this site.

This is a historic parkland associated with a listed building which has been leased to Cotham School by Bristol City Council subject to existing community use and recently 4 PROW over this land have been approved by the council and are waiting for consideration by the Planning Inspectorate ROW / 3363939

The applicant states in question 6 that there are claimed rights adjacent to the field however all 4 PROW cross this site and have been approved by the owner of the site Bristol City Council.

This statement is therefore incorrect.

There are also inconsistencies across this application as to the positioning of the poles and the fence line.

These PROW are not shown on the application and the application cannot therefore be adequately assessed and should be rejected unless this highly relevant information is included.

If the Planning Inspector approves these PROW the position of the fencing on this site would be significantly affected and therefore the position or relevant need for these CCTV poles would be inherently changed so this application is premature while awaiting the PROW decision.

Cotham School site is over 3 miles from this location. In general the school only use a small area of the fenced field for sport and pupils are under staff supervision at all times. I question the need for this extensive CCTV coverage of the site when pupils will never be on the site unaccompanied by staff.

There are already 6 CCTV cameras on the pavilion and hut at the top end of the field which cover the areas used by the school for sport and therefore question the need for further intrusive cameras and poles in this area. The lower part of the field is due to boggy grassland so are cameras needed in this area too?

Historically this land is associated with the listed building of Stoke Lodge as parkland and has been used by the community for over 100 years. Due consideration should be given to the impact of the 6 m poles to this historic setting. The cameras and poles would be intrusive and unsightly in a local historic green space enjoyed for generations by the local community.

The positioning of the poles as stated in the application is not consistent.

Camera 5 siting would obstruct a PROW. An application has previously been made for a camera in this position and was rejected by the council.

Camera 4 is very closely located to the 'Tree of Life' sculpture and this will impact the view of the tree from all angles. This may also obstruct a PROW

Camera 2 would appear to be between the canopy of protected trees – there should be consideration on placement to prevent unnecessary pruning and damage to these trees.

Camera 1 is placed in an area already covered by the cameras placed on the pavilion and is therefore not required.

As 4 x PROW cross this land the impact of the CCTV cameras and surveillance of the public legitimately walking on these routes would be inappropriate. As I regularly walk these paths and have done for more than 80 years I would feel my sense of freedom, enjoyment and calm would be eroded in this beautiful space.

During the installation of these structures large areas of land will be dug up to install cabling which will further impact the local nature and wildlife in an unacceptable manner

Should permission be given to this application I would ask that there is a specific restriction on the applicant using these poles for additional lighting which would harm the wildlife and be overtly intrusive to the local area.

In conclusion for the reasons I have outlined above – the impact on the historic building and parkland, the impact

and surveillance of the public and community using the four PROW's crossing this site and the inaccurate information included in these forms I ask that you refuse this application to preserve this historic parkland for future generations.

[REDACTED]