

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

Works to install 8no. CCTV poles and 24 cameras

(BCC LPA 25/14649/PINS)

Dear Planning Inspectorate,

This is my second comment. I am responding to the publication of the 2nd Arboricultural Impact Assessment, and commenting for the first time about the surveillance of the Field as I am a local resident.

I object to this Planning Application.

There are regulations which govern how trees with Tree Protection Orders are cared for, both generally in the Community and, more particularly, when they are to be affected by nearby development.

The regulations control whether or not a Planning Application is required to work in their Root Protection Areas; which works should not be done, and, if permission is granted; how the consented works should be done to prevent damage to the tree, now and in the future.

The regulations are guided by the expert opinion of arboriculturists who know most about tree health, tree roots and tree stability.

The local residents have, over the years, watched work be done on the Playing Field amongst the tree roots, which, in our opinion, has not followed these regulations. We have been unable to do much about it even though we have contacted those whose task it is to regulate, and enforce regulation.

If it seems that Regulations do not need to be followed, then I agree it is difficult for developers, their clients, and for the general public as observers, to know where they stand and how things should be done.

This application to work on the Field involving the erection of 8 poles, each with 3 cameras, at places along the Fence line would, if granted, mean even more development on the Field, with more digging and more concrete amongst the tree roots. There seems to be a view that if a tree does not fall over the day after some of its roots are cut, then all is well with it and will continue to be well.

The first Arboricultural Impact Assessment report submitted with this Application suggested that the cabling for the cameras was going to follow the line of the Fence. This was alarming, as the Fence in several places passes thorough many Root Protection Areas. The second Arboricultural Impact Assessment report submitted with this Application (published 27th November 2025) shows a proposed cabling route zig zagging across the Field.

This second plan may reduce slightly the amount of further work in quite as many RPAs, and hence reduce the risk of further insult for some of the trees. But the positions of some of the proposed cameras are within the RPAs of TPO trees, or are perilously close to them.

The camera diagrams show some underground projections associated with the cameras to do with the foundations for the poles and the cabling. This means that work would need to be done within an RPA, which must be harmful for the trees because it must disturb their roots by cutting them and poisoning them with concrete. It cannot be claimed otherwise.

Using the camera positions plan in the Application and the AIA cabling map in the Application, it seems to me that the following camera positions put at risk the following tree roots due to the intention to put a block of concrete 55 cm wide and 110 cm deep, and associated cabling, amongst their roots.

Unless great accuracy is applied with the positioning:

Camera 2 risks putting at risk the roots of a Turkey Oak TPO 1192 T7 and/ or a Corsican Pine TPO 1192 T8.

Camera 3 risks putting at risk the roots of a Beech and/or Lime in TPO 1192 Group 8

Camera 6 risks putting at risk the roots of Corsican Pine/Cypress/Poplar in TPO 1192 Group 1 and

Camera 7 is actually shown as being **built within** the RPAs of two oaks (T40 and T43 in the AIA) in TPO 1192 Group 6. How can a block of concrete and a cable trench “protect” these trees from damage?

(Please note I have used the Tree numbering from the TPO, not from the AIA.)

If this Application is granted consent, might we ask for Conditions based upon an Arboricultural Method Statement specific for work associated with the RPAs of the trees, most of them with TPOs, and which also denies permission for the current position of Camera 7 actually within the RPAs of two trees?

The Developer and Contractor, and the Regulator, will then have a set of rules they can rely on and work with.

As a local resident I am heartily opposed to the erection of these poles and cameras on this beautiful site.

It is totally unnecessary. The incidence of crime and the nature of the crimes associated with this green space has been at worst exaggerated or at least mis-represented. If the police have recorded as much crime as is claimed associated with a 26-acre area of grass, then it should have been brought to the attention of local Councillors, and to residents at Ward Forum meetings, and it has not been.

If these are in fact crimes occurring in the wider neighbourhood, and not associated with the Field, then that should have been clearly stated, so that it could not be used to justify surveillance of an open space. As it stands, for example, I do not know how a field can commit fraud or be burgled, as burglary is an offence to enter a building and commit theft.

Camera 4 will destroy the visual impact of the Tree Sculpture. This tree was carved from the remains of a loved Cedar of Lebanon, by a nationally known chain-saw wood sculptor. The wildlife figures to be represented were chosen by the pupils of Stoke Bishop Primary School in nearby Cedar Park. It has become a local landmark, and receives many visits every year by folk coming specifically to see it, not just coincidentally noticing it is there as they pass by on their walks. It is even marked on Google maps. Even to want to put a 6-metre pole with 3 cameras on it close by, thinking that might be acceptable, shows a lack of sensitivity which I cannot even begin to comprehend.

Camera 5 projects above the Kitchen Garden wall of the Grade II Listed House Stoke Lodge. It would have a deleterious visual impact on this Heritage Asset, intruding into the roof line and views of the parapets, and is contrary to national planning policy. How the Heritage Statement can say that it does not spoil the views of the House I do not understand.

I think the proposed amount of surveillance risks affecting the mental health of all those within range of any of the cameras. This House and its Parkland is not an off shoot of GCHQ, or an Open Prison. It is a verdant suburban residential area, and this installation risks changing the whole essence of the area, very much to its detriment. I do not think that to describe it as ruinous would be an exaggeration.