

From: Julie Wright [REDACTED]  
Sent: 27 November 2025 12:11  
To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
Subject: S62A/2025/0133. Stoke Lodge playing fields, comment

**S62A/2025/0133**

**Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene, Shirehampton, Bristol BS9 2BH**

I have studied this application and I believe it would contravene my rights to privacy in my own home under Article 8 ECHR and BCS21, and should be rejected.

I have read the report from Rapleys and have the following comments.

1.2. and 5.5

Cameras are necessary "to meet safeguarding requirements"

There are no such requirements for a school playing field that is 3 miles from the school. Indeed there is not even a requirement for a fence.

Compare this to Coombe Dingle Sports Complex owned by Bristol University in partnership with Clifton High School which is less than 1/4 mile away. A place that Cotham School has used for several years in the past to deliver some of their sports lessons. Here there are no invasive CCTV cameras around the perimeter of its 33 acres. Yet many schools and clubs use these facilities. I do not believe the University are in breach of their safeguarding duties.

1.3

"public benefits are considered to considerably outweigh any minor"

Cotham School signed a lease with Bristol City Council in 2011 which included the clause "subject to all existing rights and use of the property, including use by the community". I have lived in a house adjoining the field for over 33 years and have used the fields extensively during that time. I see no "public benefits" in being monitored and recorded 24/7 and I don't regard being watched and tracked continuously as a "minor" issue.

2.3

"school permits informal public access around the perimeter.....however this route is not a designated public right of way."

It is not for the school to "permit" it is a requirement of the lease that they signed. The outer perimeter walkway is not a PROW but there are 4 PROWs that criss cross the field. I would feel very uncomfortable walking these if there were extensive CCTV.

4.10-Para 3.1

"cameras will only be sited so they only capture images relevant to the purposes for which they are installed"

Not a true statement, if that was the case there would be no need for diagrams with "privacy screening" in the application.

Camara [REDACTED] is directly opposite my house and will have the ability to look into my bedroom, bathroom and kitchen/diner windows and garden. There is NO tree cover in front of my house. I have 8 grandchildren [REDACTED] who regularly visit each week and stay. Of course, they are not

always fully clothed in the bedroom and bathroom or, in the summer, when they use the paddling pool. I should not have to rely on computer software or a “systems operator” at Cotham School to protect their and my privacy.

#### 4.10 Para 5.1

“recorded data will not be retained for longer than is necessary”

How will I know what is being stored and for how long? There are many instances of images that have been recorded and released without prior permission of the subject. I do not want images of my grandchildren to be amongst them.

#### 4.11

“It is clear that Cotham School will comply with NPPF requirements”

Cotham School have breached these guidelines in the past. In January 2022 they installed covert CCTV cameras in a junction box on the field. In January 2023 the Information Commissioner’s Office ruled this to be unlawful and ordered them to be removed and footage deleted. Have the cameras been removed and footage deleted? I have no way of knowing. As this was clearly in breach of their Data Protection Impact Assessment, I do not believe the school can be trusted.

#### 6.13

“CCTV decision should be child centred”

Indeed it should. Cotham School bring approximately 30 children to the field for one session of about an hour, maximum twice a day during term time only. These lessons are fully supervised with adults present. Compare that to the number of children who live and visit the many properties that surround the field whose privacy will be invaded. Article 8 ECHR should be upheld for those children who live in and visit the surrounding houses, who will, otherwise be subject to a great invasion of their privacy.

#### 6.14

“will deter crime”

This is a claim often made by those in authority. Many households across the country who have CCTV yet are subject to burglaries, know this not to be true. The existing cameras on the field have not achieved this, so there is no evidence to support this claim. In 2022, despite there being CCTV cameras all around Stoke Lodge House, now the Adult Education Centre, members of the travelling community broke the padlock on the gate to the house, then removed the fence panels to access the field, where they set up their illegal camp. They were not deterred by the CCTV cameras.

#### 10.4

“potential for intrusion into neighbouring land has been minimised”

An admission that I won’t have complete privacy in my own home if this application is passed.

#### 10.6

“substantial tree coverage....a natural visible buffer....mitigates any potential privacy concerns “

Seems to contradict 10.4. There is no tree coverage in front of my house. In fact my house does not appear in the CCTV location plan used by Global MSC Security. Ref no. 202307 V1.7. My house is

shown on the photos showing the camera [REDACTED] coverage but the red and yellow circles are not concentric. If they were, they would have views of my entire house and garden.

In view of the above points, this application should be rejected.

Julie Wright

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]