

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

From: Ken Young [REDACTED]

Sent: 24 November 2025 13:48

To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Subject: Ref S62A/2025/0133

Ref S62A/2025/0133 Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene, Shirehampton, Bristol BS9 2 BH

I am writing to object to Cotham School's CCTV application to erect 8 high poles with 3 cameras per pole which have 360 degree high intensity and infra red resolution.

1) These poles and cameras will have a significant view of all the surrounding area, with visibility of neighbouring residential properties being a major intrusion on the privacy of those homes affected. This includes being able to monitor and record activity of residents inside their homes day and night, owing to the capabilities of the CCTV cameras being proposed to be used.

2) I object to being filmed and recorded while walking around the perimeter of the playing field on the pavement and public rights of way footpaths, outside the boundaries of the fields. My walking will likely be recorded from camera positions 1, 2, 3 and 4. This is unacceptable. While Cotham School has suggested that certain views would be blanked out this cannot be guaranteed or trusted, especially as software updates re set any previous settings. Who is going to keep checking up on this situation?

3) with regards to the various boundary positions, definition of Heritage, and cable lines at Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, Cotham School has failed to include correct details, or deliberately missed out details, and has incorrectly stated the Heritage status of this field. As stated by the Judge in his recent TVG decision, he said that the fields were and have always been seen as the formal grounds associated with a large country house. Any pole structures are both visible and unsympathetic with the heritage parkland surroundings, and are likely to contravene the terms of the lease.

4) OFSTED clearly state that there is no requirement for detached playing fields to be fenced off, and even less requirement for CCTV surveillance. Cotham School already have 6 CCTVs in operation, they simply do not need any more, particularly intrusive ones as proposed.

While I have listed only a few items, there are many other points of issue being raised by other individuals. I do see these poles and cameras as an unnecessary application, which if granted will be a considerable intrusion on the local residents. I believe the inspectorate has a duty of care to the local residents and not just Cotham School.

I therefore ask that this application be rejected in its entirety.

No oral submission required.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad