

From: Martin Brookman [REDACTED]

Sent: 30 November 2025 11:33

To: Section 62A Applications Non Major

<section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Subject: Objection to Application Reference Number S62A/2025/0133 - Site Address - Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene, Shirehampton, Bristol BS9 2BH

Dear Planning Officer,

I wish to lodge a formal objection to the above planning application, particularly concerning the proposed Camera [REDACTED] mounted on a 6-metre pole at [REDACTED]. My concerns are grounded in material planning considerations and statutory requirements.

Unacceptable Invasion of Privacy

It is possible from the current plans that our property at [REDACTED] could be overlooked by Camera [REDACTED]. The applicant's own visual assessments and coverage maps demonstrate that this surveillance equipment will have unobstructed views into our private garden and, in certain instances, through our windows. Each pole is specified to carry three high-resolution cameras offering complete 360° surveillance with facial recognition technology that extends significantly beyond the indicated red zones. This means our daily family life will be under perpetual observation, which contravenes both Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 and policy BCS21 regarding the protection of existing residential amenity.

While the application makes general reference to "privacy screening," there are no enforceable specifications provided regarding:

- The specific privacy zone technology to be implemented
- The precision with which such zones can be configured
- Governance and control arrangements
- Ongoing compliance verification, particularly following system upgrades

In the absence of legally binding conditions and physical screening measures, these assurances are insufficient. It is worth noting that the ICO has previously mandated the removal of covert surveillance equipment from this location, evidencing a pattern of non-compliance.

Detrimental Effect on Residential Quality of Life

The installation will fundamentally alter our family's use and enjoyment of our home. The knowledge that our private outdoor space may be under round-the-clock surveillance will create persistent unease and a sense of being watched. Normal family activities—children's outdoor play, social gatherings, or simply relaxing in our garden—will be accompanied by a feeling of exposure. This represents a substantial interference with our residential amenity rather than a trivial inconvenience, breaching Article 8 ECHR alongside local planning policies designed to protect residential wellbeing. The psychological burden of living under constant observation is significant and wholly disproportionate to any purported benefits.

Excessive and Unjustified Surveillance Measures

The school's justification centres on safeguarding requirements, yet students remain under staff supervision at all times, and the facility is only utilised for brief, timetabled activities. BS9 represents one of Bristol's safest neighbourhoods, with no recorded

incidents since June 2020. The proposed implementation of comprehensive 24/7 surveillance across a 22-acre field is disproportionate and fails to satisfy the necessity and proportionality requirements outlined in the Surveillance Camera Code of Practice.

Adverse Visual Impact and Heritage Considerations

The 6-metre pole will be prominently visible from our property and public footpaths, introducing an urbanising element into a heritage parkland environment. This is inconsistent with Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the NPPF, and local policies DM17 and BCS22. The collective visual impact of eight such poles will compromise the openness and character of this Important Open Space.

Inadequate Privacy Protection Mechanisms

The applicant's suggestion that residents may "inspect coverage following installation" does not constitute a proper safeguard. No framework exists for independent verification or enforcement. Privacy zones may be circumvented or reset through software modifications, leaving residents vulnerable. This lack of certainty is unacceptable and fails to meet obligations under UK GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018.

Summary

This CCTV proposal, particularly Camera 7, will cause demonstrable harm to residential privacy, family life, visual character, and the historic parkland setting, without proven justification or adequate mitigation measures. I respectfully urge the planning authority to refuse this application.

Yours faithfully,