

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: 24 November 2025 16:08

To: Section 62A Applications Non Major <section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

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

Letter of Objection to Cotham School's planning application for 8 CCTV towers

I wish to strongly object to this application by Cotham School - the grounds for doing so are both varied and numerous. I have set them out below:

- The submitted plans and documents contradict each other in various key respects including the location of some of the cameras/poles and the route of the proposed cabling (the arboricultural report is invalid for the purposes of the application since it addresses an entirely different cabling route!). For example, on the site location plan, there is a blue continuous line which is labelled as the school boundary. This is incorrect; the school boundary goes up to the boundaries of the site (i.e. the lease line which is marked as a dashed pink line). All the boundary trees are within the boundary of the land and within the school's leased area. A decision should not be made on the basis of an inconsistent and error filled application.
- The applicant acknowledges at Q6 that there are several claimed rights of way '*adjacent to the site*' but has not included any reference to or consideration of the impact of the proposal on these rights of way within the scope of the application. In fact, the four rights of way are **ON** the site, *not adjacent to it*, and have been approved by the Council as landowner and are awaiting consideration by the Planning Inspectorate (ROW/3363939). At least one of the proposed CCTV poles (camera 5 and possibly camera 4) would obstruct a right of way.
- Defra circular 1/09 states at paragraph 7.4 that 'all public rights of way crossing or adjoining the proposed development site must be marked on the plan to be submitted with the full planning application'. The applicant has failed to do this. In addition, the Defra guidance is clear that the information supplied by an applicant must make clear 'how the potential development will impinge on any rights of way', and that planning decision-makers must identify and take into account any rights of way affected by the development, including applications for the addition of a path, the possible existence of any other rights of way and paths not yet recorded on the definitive map. Based on the information provided by the applicant, the Planning Inspectorate will be unable to properly assess this aspect of the proposal. This is a material issue that affects the planning judgement of the Inspectorate and should cause the application to be rejected.
- The applicant states that it does not need to demonstrate necessity for the CCTV, but has gone into some detail about the alleged need to monitor pupils 100% of the time. However, pupils are never unsupervised or on break time while at the site, they are engaged in lessons and supervised by accompanying staff. The alleged risks of assault/abduction of pupils are completely unfounded, particularly in BS9 which has one of the lowest crime rates in Bristol. The proposed CCTV is completely unnecessary.
- The school claim that the CCTV cameras will not be visually intrusive - this is ABSOLUTE RUBBISH and has no basis in fact. Cameras 1, 4, 5, 6 and 8 will be particularly intrusive. By way of example, camera 5 would obstruct a Public Right of Way. Indeed, a CCTV

camera in this location has previously been refused by BCC and that refusal was not appealed by Cotham School.

- While the application suggests that privacy screening will be applied to mitigate the overlooking of private spaces, it fails to address the issue that the playing fields are subject to a lease which provides for shared use by the community. As a much-loved community amenity space, the proposed high level of surveillance (described by the school as monitoring 100% of a 22 acre field, 100% of the time) is inappropriate, unsettling and intrusive. It is also inappropriate for the area (which has one of the lowest crime rates in Bristol) and for the heritage parkland environment.

For all of the above reasons (and others too numerous to mention but comprehensively covered in objections submitted by others) I would urge you to reject the school's application. What they are seeking to do is wholly inappropriate and detrimental to the local environment. Shame on them.

Please note that I do not wish to make an oral submission should a hearing be arranged.

Many thanks for considering my submission.

Alan Taylor

