

Objection to Planning Application

[REDACTED]

Section 62A Applications Non Major

Karen Cole

[REDACTED]

Objection to Planning Application

Planning Application details:

Section 62A Planning Application: S62A/2025/0133 Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene, Shirehampton, Bristol BS9 2BH

I am objecting to the application on the following basis.

1. Failure by Bristol City Council to comply with the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) in the original decision to grant permitted development of fencing at Stoke lodge.

I object to this application on the basis that the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED), as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, was not properly considered or evidenced in the previous decision to grant permitted development to Cotham school for a fence around the greenspace. This has a direct bearing upon the application in question.

The introduction of the fence has had clear and demonstrable adverse impacts on disabled people, including those with mobility impairments, chronic illnesses, or anxiety conditions who previously used the land freely for exercise, wellbeing, and social connection. Some disabled users now avoid the site entirely because of restricted access, changes to routes, loss of informal paths, or the psychological impact of the fencing.

Where a public authority fails to demonstrate “conscious and rigorous” consideration of the PSED at the earlier stage, the duty remains unfulfilled, and – crucially – it is a continuing duty. It must be satisfied before further decisions dependent on or arising from the original decision are taken.

Therefore the PSED must now be undertaken before the cctv application can be lawfully determined.

Because the applicant states that the cctv towers are required in part to protect the fence, this application is dependent upon the earlier decision to grant permitted development for the fence. Where the original installation already has unequal or discriminatory impacts, and where no adequate PSED assessment was carried out, the council must now undertake or require:

A proper, evidence-based equality impact assessment,

Considering the actual impacts of the fence, particularly on disabled people and other protected groups,

Before determining any planning application that seeks to reinforce, extend, or operationalise that earlier decision.

Failure to do so risks breaching the Equality Act 2010 and renders any related planning decision vulnerable to challenge.

Cumulative equality impacts of the cctv towers have not been considered.

The proposed eight large CCTV towers will not only entrench the negative impacts of the fencing but may introduce additional burdens on disabled users, including:

Increased feelings of surveillance or exclusion, for example for people with mental health conditions, autism, or PTSD.

Physical obstruction or further restriction of accessible routes.

Visual dominance and loss of amenity for disabled people who rely on open, welcoming community spaces.

These impacts must be assessed through the PSED before the application can legally or properly be considered.

I also object to the application on the basis of lack of evidence to support the applicant's case.

The applicant references:

1. DM Policy DM14 (The Health Impacts of Development)

- Requires development to contribute to reducing the causes of ill health, improving health and

reducing health inequalities – which include safeguarding and crime reduction – within the city.

RAPLEYS LLP | 19 Planning Supporting Statement

Stoke lodge is a low crime area used by the community for 70 years during which time they have never requested cctv towers and monitoring at the site suggesting that the community (who use the site in more than the school) do not require cctv towers. There is no evidence provided by the applicant to support the assertion that the cctv cameras will reduce health inequalities, reduce the causes of ill health and improve health.

There has been no consultation or Equalities Impact Assessment and no data to support the assertion that the cctv (and fence) reduce health inequalities. There is no evidenced demand from people with protected characteristics (or the local community) for cctv at the site (they have not been consulted and should have been).

Finally I object to the cctv on the grounds of it being invasive to my privacy, being overbearing and unsympathetic to the greenspace, not being required (the school use the upper part of the field), and causing huge loss of amenity value.

Kind regards

Karen Cole