

From: Yvan Costes [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 November 2025 21:47
To: Section 62A Applications Non Major
<section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Objection to application S62A/2025/0133 (Stoke Lodge playing fields)

Hello,

I would like to add a 7th point to my objection.

I have read recently in the local paper that the school is claiming that the fence has been subject to "1,000s" of pounds worth of damage recently. Hence the need for "protection".

I live nearby and have observed by myself that this claim is absolutely false. And so have many other people.

A handful panels have been removed, some of them very legitimately as illegally blocking some paths that should be left open. All panels have been left undamaged next to their openings. Any half-competent DIYer would remount them with one hour with one simple tool.

The school is clearly trying to turn this into an excuse for CCTV.
This area is one of the safest in Bristol. CCTV is absolutely not required.

What scares me though, is the knowledge that a public body can use public funds to spread misleading information (or said differently: to lie shamelessly) for the purpose of supporting their planning application - that is truly shocking.

I am actually afraid of a public body that feels they can get away with any lie unchallenged. This is a behaviour at the absolute opposite of the Nolan principles.

You must see through this. This should not turn into a prison-looking camp Stoke Lodge.

Sincerely
Yvan Costes
[REDACTED]

On Wed, 12 Nov 2025, 22:29 Yvan Costes, [REDACTED] wrote:
Ref application S62A/2025/0133
Site address " Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene, Shirehampton, Bristol BS9 2BH.

Hello,

I strongly object to this application on the following grounds:

- 1- The application does not take into account the current Public Rights Of Way. While those PROWs may be contested, legally they stand at the time of the application. And the application is not compatible with the PROWs.
- 2- The excavation work for the cables (about 1000m I would estimate!), with the consequential damage to the area, is enormous in comparison to the alledged purpose
- 3- CCTV is not required for the school to use the playing fields, neither legally nor practically. The school could use and has used the fields before without those CCTV
- 4- The lease states that the field should be for use by the community. These CCTVs are an extreme breach of privacy and are very intrusive.
- 5- The visual impact of these CCTVs is absolutely awful, and completely inappropriate for the area. I can only think of a prison camp when looking at the plans: a scary combination of fence and CCTV masts. Completely out of touch with the planning designation as Important Ooen Space. It would create an appressive atmosphere, and I would feel much less safe in the area with these horrors in sight.
- 6- Erecting new structure is in direct breach of the lease (why is not mentioned?)

Regards
Yvan Costes

