

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 26 November 2025 22:21

To: Section 62A Applications Non Major

<section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Subject: Ref S62A/2025/0133. Stoke Lodge Playing fields, West Dene, BS9 2BH

Stoke Lodge is an important Open Space to be used for recreation, leisure and community use and with value as a visual amenity. It is a natural green space which the local community treasures for its appearance and attractiveness as a green “oasis”. The eight masts and the 24 cameras suggested for installation by the applicant are in a submission without any accompanying drawings to show how the masts would project above sensitive areas near to the Grade II listed building, Stoke Lodge. Nor is there any illustration of the nasty impact on the silhouette and roof scape of the house caused by the location of the masts which would clash horribly with the open green space as a visual amenity in this historic parkland.

In addition, there is an “easement strip” under which gas main pipes are located. This arrangement is recorded in a lease between Bristol CC and Wales and West utilities and it prohibits any activity on or under the easement strip. The cabling for the lights and cameras proposed by the applicant crosses the easement strip at two points, and should cancel out any validity in their proposal.

My house is not affected by the viewing scope of the proposed masts and cameras, but SL playing fields are subject to a lease which provides for shared use by the community. Having a high level of surveillance of SL (100% of the time , 24/7) is not only an intrusion into the activities on the Lodge of the local users but from a security point of view is not appropriate to a heritage parkland setting in an area that has one of the lowest crime rates in Bristol. I am aggrieved by the prospect of 24 cameras watching my every move. The applicant has used only the top third of the fields (they are not doing so at the moment) and has always insisted that their first fence and the current new fence is there to safeguard the students and give the protection of permanent supervision. They even suggested that the safeguarding function of the fence was “essential” and a requirement by the School Inspectorate. Neither claim is true. Pupils on the Lodge have been supervised by their teachers and safely guided to and from their transport. To say now in their application that 24 cameras in use 24/7 is necessary is nonsensical, because as well as the proposed cameras, there are already cameras placed on the pavilion, and covertly in a box near the corner of the Lodge . The latter was ordered to be removed by the Information Commissioner’ s office .

The proposed masts would impact the users of the several public rights of way on the site (not “adjacent to it” as the applicant has it) the Rights of way have been approved by the council and are awaiting consideration by the Planning Inspectorate. Camera 5 in the planning application would actually obstruct a PROW and this would be clear if the applicant had submitted drawings of the rights of the way across the site. But they failed to do so. They also failed to show how the location of cameras and masts would impinge in the rights of way, so the Planning inspectorate will be unable to assess this

aspect of the proposal. Continuing in their vein of deficient information, the applicant has not posted notice of their proposal on the land itself nor in the local press.

I firmly believe this application for masts and cameras is deficient, unnecessary, harmful to the public amenity of SL , a stain on the visual amenity of the Lodge, and a smear on the integrity of the local community.