

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 November 2025 14:34
To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Fwd: Objection to Application No 25/14649/PINS - 8 CCTV Poles and Cameras at Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, BS9 2BH

Application No. 25/14649/PINS Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene, Shirehampton

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

23 Nov 2011

Dear Planning Team,

I object to the Subject Planning Application on the basis of the following material planning considerations:

- Loss of Privacy/Overlooking: Cameras 5, 6, 7 and 8 directly overlook my daughter's bedroom window on the 3rd floor, southeast elevation, as well as the master bedroom window and balcony on the south westerly elevation and the second-floor bedroom on the north easterly elevation. At this time of year, there is no protection offered by the trees on the edge of Stoke Lodge and our bedroom windows will be in the direct sightline of at least 3 of these cameras. Whilst traverse limitations and privacy screening could be put on camera 6, it will be visible from our balcony and rear windows, our garden and bedrooms will all be in the fields of view. **We would feel a significant loss of privacy, under constant surveillance in our own home.**
- Overbearing and out of character. 6m high CCTV cameras and poles seem entirely unsympathetic to the character of this green space and overbearing, particularly as it overlooks a residential area and children's playground.
- Heritage Concerns. Camera 5, in such close proximity to Stoke Lodge seems to be particularly detrimental to the longstanding nature of the area.
- Disproportionate Impact. The application talks of keeping children safe yet I have never seen Cotham School children use the bottom of the Stoke Lodge fields. Conversely, I see 100s of members of the public enjoy the freedom and beauty of this 'Important Open Space'. When purchasing our property we sought legal advice on how this land might be used. It found that the lease includes a prohibition on erecting new structures. This application seems to be contrary to that.

Should the Planning Inspectorate decide a hearing is necessary I would wish to voice my concerns in person.

Yours,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]