

Good morning Planning Inspectorate

There are a number of reasons why I am raising an objection to the application to put 8 pylons each mounted with 3 CCTV cameras on the Parkland of Stoke Lodge, Shirehampton Road, Stoke Bishop Bristol BS9 1BN or as Cotham call the land Stoke Lodge Sports Ground, Shirehampton Road, Sea Mills Bristol BS9 2BH.

### **Amenity Value**

The lease that Cotham School signed was subject to all existing rights including use by the community. Obviously when the school is using a part of the field then the community will respect that area. However, as a member of the local community I feel that the imposition of 24hour CCTV with, I believe, an additional 24 extra cameras to be a huge loss of amenity value to myself in terms of the visits that I make to the parkland. The enjoyment of a quiet stroll, kickabouts with the grandchildren or picnic at the weekend that has been enjoyed over the last forty years would never feel the same knowing that every move is being recorded. It is not clear to me but my understanding from the documentation it is that the recording comes with the capability of sound as well as sight.

### **Public Rights of Way**

The application has failed to mark four different Public Rights of Way (PROW) on the plans thus not allowing the Planning Inspectorate (PI) to fully take this into account when considering the application. I suggest the PI ask for resubmission of the application to rectify for this omission by the applicant.

### **Proportional Use of the Site**

The school use the grass (and then often only a small part) during term time only for between 3 to 5 days each week twice each morning for no more than 1 hour (often only 45mins) at a time. The school has c1,200 pupils and is 3 miles away.

That equates to  $40 \times 4 \times 2 \times 1 = 320$  hours per annum

The community are using the area 52 weeks of the year for 7 days of the week during daylight hours (say 10 per day). When the school are present the community restrict themselves to the gardens and arboretum. The community has a population of around 10,000 people living within a mile radius of Stoke Lodge.

That equates to  $52 \times 7 \times 10 = 3640$  hours per annum

Clearly the proportional use by community outweighs the school use by a multiple of at least 10. For this reason both the community and the school should be meeting together and agreeing on a subject such as the installation of structures such as fences, pylons and CCTV surveillance. Despite several requests to hold meetings to discuss such questions of great interest to both parties – the school have yet to agree do anything towards mutual understanding. Therefore, I object to this application on the grounds that it is made out of all proportion with the use made of the 23 acre site.

### **Cabling**

All of the 8 camera pylon positions laid out in the application will require additional cabling. All of the positions are within the canopies of trees or tree groups with Tree Protection Orders (TPO). The additional cabling cannot be allowed to affect the tree roots of such trees. Most if not all of the TPO trees predate the lease that Cotham School have with Bristol City Council (BCC).

### **Camera Positions**

I object to five of the camera positions set out in the application.

Camera 1 is only slightly away from the pavilion near the West Dene entrance to Stoke Lodge. The 3 CCTV camera already mounted on the tower above the pavilion surely cover the same area that camera 1 is designed to cater for. This is unnecessary duplication.

Camera 2 is between the Black Pine and the Turkey Oak (both TPO trees). I object to this position as it will obviously require unnecessary pruning to these two mature trees in the future when the camera becomes obscured by the leaf and branch growth that will naturally occur.

Camera 4 is too close to the tree sculpture admired by everyone in the community. The proximity is such that the amenity value of the Tree of Life sculpture will be impinged from most angles. The camera as such will also be covering the Arboretum area that is not part of the lease held by the school. Please refuse a camera in the position 4.

Camera 5 is virtually the same position that was refused by BCC when the school made an earlier planning application. The refusal was on account of the negative impact on the heritage and amenity value of the site in the parkland. I am not aware that this refusal has been rectified in this subsequent application to a different authority.

Camera 8 is shown in various positions in the application. Therefore, I suggest should be refused until the final position is known and then objections can be reassessed.

### **Criminal Damage**

One of the reasons that Cotham school give for requesting extra additional CCTV cameras is the incidences of criminal damage. As a regular user of the site, I can remember very few instances of damage to cameras or fencing. I do recall that during Covid when the government was asking for people to exercise in their own neighbourhood that the school locked the gates and it should have been no surprise to them that despite email & telephone requests to open the gates to no avail that two panels at either end of the fence were removed to permit access in accordance with government suggestions. Many local golf clubs (Henbury & Shirehampton) were much quicker to react and give public access to their open space.

The second instance I recall was when a covert camera was installed by the Adult Education Centre gateway and covered by a plastic sheet when the school ignored requests to turn it off or even admit that it was operational. I believe it was only when a local MP took an interest in the matter and brought it to the attention of the school that the camera was switched off. In fact my belief was that the covert filming by the school might well itself have been the criminal activity in that instance.

### **Summary**

The reasons that worry me about application S62A/2025/0133 at Stoke Lodge Playing Fields - being the harm to the Amenity value & Heritage status of the site, the inappropriate proportionality of the application based on the use of the site, the potential damage to the TPO trees and groups at the site and the omission of the PROW routes and inclusion of excessive damage report claims in the application.

Please do not let Stoke Lodge resemble a prison camp by following the fencing with 6 metre camera pylons.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, I respectfully urge the Planning Inspectorate to refuse the planning application for the installation of further CCTV cameras and associated pylons.

Cheers John Moore  
2 December 2025