

From: [Chris Harries](#)
To: [Section 62A Applications Non Major](#)
Subject: S62A/2025/0133 Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene, Shirehampton, Bristol, BS9 2BH
Date: 03 December 2025 10:54:45

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

From: Mr C Harries, [REDACTED]

(I wish to make a written, not oral, submission.)

I write to object formally to Cotham School's Application for Planning Permission (see reference above) for Works to install 8 additional CCTV towers, each with three cameras, on Stoke Lodge field.

There are many objections to the proposal, which is excessive beyond sense, that can be put forward; and to start with the plans and documents submitted by Cotham School cannot always be reconciled with each other or are unclear (e.g. the exact positioning of Camera 8). But as one principal basis for objection it is hard to see how the scheme does not radically conflict with the Local Plan, under which the field is designated as an IOS (Important Open Space) under Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (SADMP). These define development thereon as not to be permitted 'unless.....ancillary to the open space use'.

In what way can these 24 *additional* cameras be regarded as 'ancillary to the open space use'? Similar criteria are applied under the proposed new Local Plan, with the field to be defined as a Local Green Space (ref. LGS32011). Again, it can hardly be argued that 24 new cameras are 'ancillary' to use of the open space. On the contrary, together with the fence, they would precisely remove the open-ness.

I am not the only objector making this point - that Cotham School's plans entirely contradict local plan designations - but the fact of the contradiction bears repeating.

Having lived in close proximity to Stoke Lodge for [REDACTED] and having watched our children and now grandchildren enjoy many happy times on the field, my wife and I are dismayed by Cotham School's unjustifiable attempt to impose its regime of restriction, exclusion and now surveillance, on a beautiful piece of land. What public benefit would accrue from it being taken from us, to any extent, in this way? Our own use of the land for regular walks is already being spoilt by Cotham's depredations and our quality of life thus diminished, for no good reason. Cotham's cameras would make the process irretrievably worse.

Chris Harries