

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 November 2025 12:36
To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Application Reference: S62A/2025/0133

Application Reference: S62A/2025/0133

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

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to object to planning application S62A/2025/0133; for eight CCTV poles at Stoke Lodge Playing Fields. I believe this proposal is unjustified and deeply harmful to a valued local green space; inconsistent with the Bristol Local Plan and wider planning legislation.

The proposed development represents an excessive and unnecessary level of surveillance within an open, undeveloped field that contains public rights of way - used by the community for informal recreation and notably a condition of (applicant) Cotham's 2011 Lease.

I am particularly concerned that every pole would support three cameras, resulting in a total of 24 cameras operating continuously across the site, as well as existing CCTV cameras. This scale of surveillance is wholly inappropriate in a suburban residential area and would fundamentally alter the nature and atmosphere of what is currently a valued public green space. Rather than enhancing safety, it is likely to create a hostile, intimidating and unwelcoming environment for ordinary users; the impact on residential privacy would be severe.

The poles are of a height that would allow views into neighbouring gardens and potentially first-floor bedrooms. The cameras include pan-tilt-zoom and night-vision capabilities, and the applicant has provided no enforceable technical constraints or binding safeguards to ensure private land will not be captured. This raises an unavoidable risk of unlawful monitoring of private homes. Planning decisions must consider whether a proposal like this can operate lawfully, and in this case there is clear conflict with the UK GDPR principles of proportionality and data minimisation. A system with 24 capable, adjustable cameras in such proximity to housing simply cannot be guaranteed to avoid capturing private domestic areas.

The proposal is also inconsistent with the policies of the Bristol Local Plan. It conflicts with BCS21 (Quality Urban Design) and DM27 (Local Character and Distinctiveness) by introducing intrusive, industrial-scale infrastructure that is entirely out of keeping with the character of the playing fields and surrounding residential roads. It conflicts with BCS23 (Pollution) due to the level of visual intrusion and amenity harm caused by constant surveillance equipment, and with DM10 (Landscape Design) and DM26 (Local Parks and Green Spaces) by failing to protect the open, informal and recreational nature of the site. The development would also fail to meet the expectations of DM14 (Public Realm), as it would create an environment that feels monitored, hostile and discouraging for local residents. The visual harm extends beyond individual privacy. The cumulative visual impact of eight tall poles scattered across an otherwise open field would significantly degrade the character of the landscape; this level of clutter is disproportionate and unacceptable within a residential green space, where the expectation is one of openness and unobstructed views and the harm would be constant and unavoidable for residents and users of the parkland.

Heritage considerations also weigh heavily against the proposal because the site forms part of the setting of Stoke Lodge House, a Grade II listed building. Under Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, decision makers must give "special regard" to preserving the building's overall setting. The introduction of eight surveillance poles and 24 cameras would cause clear visual harm within this sensitive heritage context and therefore fails to meet this statutory duty.

In addition, a previous application affecting this site was refused partly because of its proximity to a children's play area and the listed building. Those concerns remain relevant; especially

after two covert cameras were installed (without permission) in a cabinet at this spot, before being detected by locals and later disabled. The current proposal intensifies these issues by multiplying the number of structures and greatly expanding the surveillance footprint, on an under-used playing field. This application also lacks the necessary justification; no crime data, risk assessment, safeguarding audit, or credible evidence of persistent vandalism or anti-social behaviour has been provided.

Assertions about risk have been exaggerated yet again, because police crime figures show low anti-social behaviour in this area. Equally, a comparable neighbouring field that my house overlooks is within yards of Stoke Lodge and is used daily by several local schools; nonetheless, it can function successfully without CCTV and so is unequivocal proof that this proposal is disproportionate, unnecessary and lacking any credibility.

Approving this application would set an undesirable precedent, potentially encouraging the installation of high-surveillance infrastructure in other local parks and green spaces without any clear justification. Such a precedent would be contrary to local planning principles that emphasise openness, public enjoyment and respect for residential amenity.

Finally, installing such extensive surveillance infrastructure risks damaging public confidence because Residents value Stoke Lodge Playing Fields as a safe, accessible and welcoming place but by imposing 24 cameras it would create an impression of danger that does not reflect the reality of this quiet, low-crime area, and would discourage ordinary, beneficial community use of the space, including passive policing.

For all of these reasons—including conflict with numerous Local Plan policies; disproportionate scale, severe privacy risks, statutory heritage harm, lack of necessity and real evidence; cumulative visual impact, and unacceptable effects on public amenity - I respectfully request that the Planning Inspectorate refuse planning application S62A/2025/0133.

Yours Truly,
S. J. Mayer (Mrs)

[REDACTED]