

From: [Della Hooper](#)
To: [Section 62A Applications Non Major](#)
Subject: S62A/2025/0133 - Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene, Shirehampton, Bristol BS9 2BH
Date: 05 December 2025 08:52:13

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Sirs,

I wish to object to the planning application for addition CCTV cameras on Stoke Lodge.

1. There are already 6 x 24 hour, days days a week CCTV cameras on Stoke Lodge, which already cover the pavilion and storage area. The application cites crime as a justification for requesting 24 cameras in total. Stoke Lodge is not an area of high crime that would warrant this level of surveillance and the cameras in place already provide adequate security. What evidence exists that this level of security is needed to monitor historic parkland, that prior to this application has been loved rather than vandalised by the community? Based on the complete lack of cited evidence, the deterrent of crime justification is completely disingenuous.

2. The planning application states that the 24/7 cameras are needed for safeguarding the schools children. Any children from the school that are onsite for sport now have a 6 foot parameter fence, 6 x 24/7 cameras and presumably the required level of school staff supervision. Previous appeals have demonstrated that this is not required in law, school playing fields up and down the country do not use significant tax payer funds to push for this level of security in the name of safeguarding, therefore this is wholly disproportionate.

3. The application for security cameras focuses solely on Stoke Lodge as a playing field, however there are 4 public rights of way. Whilst the school now dispute these to bolster their planning applications, these rights of way are longstanding, the exist and they are regularly used. I object to the application on grounds of privacy; for the children and families who use SL not to be filmed without their consent, (where is this film being stored, who has access?) and I object to the significant intrusion of privacy for this families who will have cameras facing into their properties.

4. Finally, I object to the application based on the visual and environmental impact of the planned security surveillance. These are large, intrusive cameras, of a nature consistent with security needs on a business park or trading estate, not parkland. The application for industrial style, high security cameras would damage the character of a vitally important space where people of all ages can enjoy nature whilst supporting their physical and mental health.

I would urge you to reject this application as disproportionate for all the reasons above.
Thank you for reading.

Della Hooper