

**S62A/2025/0133 and 25/14649/PINS Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene, Bristol
BS92BH**

I strongly object to this planning application and endorse the comprehensive assessments of it by both the We Love Stoke Lodge community group and the Bristol Tree Forum which include the many omissions, inaccuracies and procedural errors in the application documents. I agree with and support the detailed reasons they give in their letters of objection that in view of local and national planning policies the application should be refused.

Knowing that the open space at Stoke Lodge was in all but name the local park for Stoke Bishop and wanting to live within walking distance of this beautiful, interesting and historic place, on retirement I moved here in 2003. I knew that since its purchase by the Bristol Corporation the parkland of Stoke Lodge had been used by local residents for informal recreation alongside its use as a school playing field. I also knew that the parkland had been designated as an "Important Open Space" in the 1966 Development Plan and later Local Plans. Living within a few minutes walk, for the last [REDACTED] I have regularly and frequently enjoyed walking on this parkland appreciating its many, mature trees, some unusual like the two huge Lucombe Oak trees, its extensive views towards the ridge line of the Grade II* registered Blaise and the Grade II registered Kings Weston Parks and Gardens, and the sight of the Grade II* listed Blaise Castle folly. As the parkland is open to view it provides a safe, open space with no security issues for people using it. It is also a sociable space with the chance to talk to other local residents and feel part of the community. There is no other such park that I and the other residents of Stoke Bishop, and the western part of Sneyd Park, can walk to. Without being able to use Stoke Lodge we would have to drive (or be driven if one can no longer do this) to either Canford Park in Westbury-on-Trym or the Downs.

My objections to this planning application, explained in detail in the letters from We Love Stoke Lodge and the Bristol Tree Forum, are :

I. the harmful visual damage that the proposed camera poles would have on the Grade II listed Stoke Lodge house, its curtilage-listed gazebo and adjoining garden walls, and its historic parkland which would damage the significance of Stoke Lodge as a heritage asset.

In 2018 [REDACTED], the Council's Principal Historic Environment Officer, confirmed that because the parkland was laid out and used as the designed landscape setting for the house it forms the curtilage of the listed building. Consequently it would therefore require particular protection from harmful development. Following the applicants' submissions, however, the Council changed this view, which had the effect of allowing the applicants to erect a 2m high fence around the applicant's leased land under permitted development rights.

As the Council's incomprehensible change of view is contested by objectors including myself, I ask that the Planning Inspectorate consider and make a decision of the extent of the boundary of this curtilage.

Nevertheless, in ‘The Setting of Heritage Assets’ 2017 Historic England gives guidance on understanding and managing change within the settings of such heritage assets. From this it is clear that the height, siting, and utilitarian and incongruous appearance of the proposed camera poles would do irreparable harm to the heritage asset of Stoke Lodge rather than protect it.

2. the unacceptable invasion of the privacy of people legitimately walking on the parkland being filmed without their knowledge and consent. The applicants’ 2011 lease from the Council stipulates that their tenancy is “subject also to all existing rights and use of the Property including use by the community “. Furthermore there are four public rights of way across the land. If filming was permitted I would no longer want to walk there and so would be denied the right to do.

3. no need for the poles and cameras has been proven by the applicants. Both the Department of Education and Ofsted have confirmed that there is no requirement for such a detached playing field to be fenced. Furthermore, schools’ sports use and local people’s use of the land have always peacefully co-existed without problems.

I therefore ask that this application is refused. If however the Planning Inspectorate is minded to approve it, only temporary permission should be granted with stringent conditions including that no additional equipment such as lighting should be added to the camera poles without further consent.

R. M. Corner, [REDACTED]