

From: Paul Spellward [REDACTED]

Sent: 23 November 2025 15:05

To: Section 62A Applications Non Major

<section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

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

Dear Sirs,

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

I wish to object to this planning application for 8 CCTV towers.

These proposed towers are inappropriate for the site (ugly metal structures on a heritage parkland location).

These proposed towers overlook multiple adjacent properties. It cannot be legitimate to record activity on individual private plots, including through windows.

These proposed towers are irrelevant for the protection or supervision of Cotham School pupils participating in sport, because such pupils are always supervised and in the care of Cotham School staff.

Camera 5 appears to obstruct a public right of way and in any case a previous application for CCTV at this location was refused on heritage grounds (and not appealed), so should be again.

Camera 4 would be close to the Tree of Life and the second sculpture to be. A 6 metres ugly tower damages the visual amenity of this particularly sensitive part of Stoke Lodge parkland.

Camera 3 appears to rely on cabling crossing land where no excavation is permitted due to gas mains. One wonders at the competence of those working on this project.

Cotham School rarely uses the northern end of the site. The proposed coverage of CCTV towers is excessive, even if any were legitimately required.

The applicant's claim that CCTV and fencing is required for safeguarding is completely spurious. There is no Ofsted requirement, as was admitted under oath in the recent High Court hearing by the Cotham School Head Teacher.

The applicant's Heritage statement is highly inaccurate. It fails to acknowledge the obvious historic attachment of the parkland and the listed house (Stoke Lodge). This is not "playing fields", it is parkland with a lease for use for school playing field and shared community use. The applicant has provided no proof of any need to intervene and damage this highly sensitive heritage landscape.

I urge you to reject this application in its entirety.

Yours sincerely,

Paul SPELLWARD

[REDACTED]