

From: [Michael Shinner](#)
To: [Section 62A Applications Non Major](#)
Subject: Re: Application reference number S62A/2025/0133
Date: 04 December 2025 22:28:52

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

> On 4 Dec 2025, at 10:18 pm, Michael Shinner [REDACTED] wrote:

>

>

>

> Site address Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene, Shirehampton Bristol BS9 2BH

>

> As a resident of the area adjacent to Stoke Lodge Playing Fields since [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] I would like register my objections to proposals by Cotham School to install 24
surveillance cameras.

> My objections are on a number of grounds

> 1. I am not aware of any significant number of incidents occurring on the playing fields in the [REDACTED] years I have
lived here that would merit the expense and intrusiveness of the proposed cameras. I have raised 3 children and
with my 6 grandchildren Stoke Lodge has been an important place away from roads and screens.

> 2. It is not clear who would have access to the images recorded by the cameras including those of residents
and their children and the pupils from Cotham and any other teams they may play against

> 3. The playing fields are the last remaining undeveloped areas following the loss of the other playing fields to
housing. Clearly the cameras are intended to dissuade residents from going on the playing fields but to be
immediately effective there would need to be a mechanism connecting the camera images to some authority
who would presumably dispatch some means to remove the intruders. This would potentially lead to unpleasant
scenes of possible violence. This is particularly likely to happen when residents use the long established Rights
of Way. The alternative mechanism is to use the cameras to address the "intruders" to instruct them to leave the
area. This has already been happening from the existing low height monitoring cameras and is very disturbing
for nearby residents including those with health issues such as those who live in the council homes immediately
adjacent to Stoke Lodge on Ebenezer Lane.

> 4. The idea of the need for cameras seems to support Cotham School management's paranoia which is already
evidenced by their insistence on installing substantial and expensive fencing even though there is no
requirement under Government documentation. It is even more inappropriate in a low crime and peaceful area
like Stoke Bishop.

> Thank you for taking time to read the objections I have listed

> Michael Shinner and family

> Sent from my iPad