

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 17 December 2025 09:23  
**To:** Section 62A Applications Non Major  
<section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** S62A/2025/0133 Stoke Lodge, 2nd update objection

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

**Works to install 8 CCTV poles and 24 cameras  
(BCC LPA 25/14649/PINS)**

*Fiona Evans*  
[REDACTED]

---

1. A quick point before my main objection- I'm not aware of any other schools that have (or feel the need for) blanket CCTV surveillance of PE lessons on their playing fields. The Head admitted on oath in court that Ofsted and the DfE do not require playing fields to be fenced, still less monitored 24/7.
1. Yesterday the council emailed me to inform me ref Planning Enforcement : 25/30495) that "the mobile compounds, CCTV and associated equipment require planning permission as well as a submission which was made by the school on 24.11.25. We have concluded that these three compounds and the installations within them require planning permission and are therefore unlawful." The school is now in its second period of conducting unlawful surveillance on the field.

My main point is that the Heritage Statement provided by Cotham School is inaccurate and therefore unreliable. The land surrounding Stoke Lodge (Stoke Lodge Playing Fields) is the historic estate of the listed building, Stoke Lodge House. It is really worrying that the applicant has tried to categorise it in a different way to suit their development.

I agree with The Conservation Team at Bristol City council 's objection on the Bristol Council portal dated 28th November 2025, in particular :

2.16 & 2.17

"where the Tithe map provides , is a clearly defined package of land around the building in a single ownership and occupation, and referred to here as a small parkland. The package was stated as in the ownership and occupation of Thomas Bowman." (In contrast to the applicants Heritage Statement)

And paragraph 2.33

"..we are required to consider the grounds around, and associated directly with, Stoke Lodge as a heritage asset in their own right. This is separate from those assets

considered as curtilage Listed, but must be understood as an indivisible part of them with the host mansion. “

Also 4.6 “We note that planning consent is required where the erection of a fence would take place within the curtilage of a listed building. It is the view of Conservation that this should be applied for retrospectively.”

BCC officers confirmed to Cotham School in July 2018 that the playing fields were the curtilage of a listed building, so that a planning application would be required for a fence. It is refreshing to see that seven years later the Conservation team identifies the correct status of the land.

Planning law exists for a reason. They are there to protect landscapes, heritage assets, wildlife and local communities before irreversible changes are made. A protected landscape is not a neutral act.

Across the country, communities are asking the same question. Why are normal planning and environmental safeguards repeatedly being bypassed and treated as a routine part of the business model rather than a sign that a site may simply be unsuitable? These are serious, legitimate concerns, and they deserve proper scrutiny.