From: ian c Sent:

To: section62anonmajor@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Subject: Fw: Objection to Application S62A/2025/0133 – CCTV Poles at Stoke Lodge

Application Reference: S62A/2025/0133

Site Address: Stoke Lodge Playing Fields Shirehampton Road Bristol BS9 1BN

Please find my formal objection to the proposed installation of eight CCTV poles at Stoke Lodge playing fields. I am a resident of and my home is directly affected by this development. My full comments are attached below for consideration.

<u>3M</u>

# 1. Serious Intrusion into My Home and Family Life

Our home sits directly opposite the field, with a clear line of sight to several of the proposed poles. The cameras will operate day and night, providing 360-degree, high-resolution coverage. This would place our home, including our front bedroom and the front of the property, under continuous surveillance.

This is a significant and unacceptable loss of privacy for my family. Privacy masking is not a reliable safeguard, and once the equipment is installed we would have no control over what is recorded, viewed or stored. The ongoing awareness of our home being watched is a direct loss of residential amenity.

<u>3M</u>

### 2. Visual Intrusion and the "Enclosed" Feeling Created by Fencing and Poles

The high fencing already installed has changed the character of the fields and our outlook. Adding multiple tall, industrial poles will heighten that sense of enclosure and make the area feel more like a secure compound than community green space. This is entirely at odds with the open, natural appearance Stoke Lodge has always had.

<u>3M</u>

# 3. Impact on a Vulnerable Neighbour Who Cannot Object

One of our neighbours, who lives directly opposite one of the proposed camera locations, is a vulnerable adult who spends most of her day sitting in her front window.

This window faces the field and would be in full view of the camera. She is unable to submit an objection herself.

Placing a tall pole with fixed, high-resolution cameras directly opposite her only living-space window is a serious intrusion into her privacy. It would mean she is effectively monitored every day in her own home, without her understanding or consent. This is an unacceptable loss of amenity for someone who cannot advocate for herself.

<u>3M</u>

### 4. Harm to the Heritage Setting

Stoke Lodge forms part of the historic landscape surrounding the Grade II listed Stoke Lodge House. The fields have long been valued for their open views, mature trees and green character. The proposed poles and cameras will significantly alter this setting. The Heritage Statement fails to properly assess this harm and overlooks the historical relationship between the land and the listed building.

<u>3M</u>

## 5. Public Rights of Way Ignored and Affected

My family and many local residents use the public rights of way across the fields. The school has previously acknowledged these paths, yet the application:

- does not map the PROWs,
- does not assess their impact,
- and places at least one pole directly on a claimed PROW.

Users of a public footpath should not be filmed by multiple fixed cameras. This affects amenity, the experience of using a right of way, and the openness that has always defined the site.

<u>3M</u>

## 6. Wildlife, Ecology and TPO-Protected Trees

Stoke Lodge is rich in wildlife, including birds, bats, foxes and other species that rely on the trees and green space. Many trees are protected by Tree Preservation Orders. The installation of concrete bases and underground cabling risks damaging root protection areas and disturbing wildlife. The application does not provide adequate arboricultural evidence or demonstrate how harm will be prevented.

<u>3M</u>

7. Previous Hidden Cameras Make the System Unreliable and Untrustworthy

Cotham School has previously installed hidden cameras at Stoke Lodge without permission. This history makes it difficult to trust the proposed system or the assurances given. A permanent, high-resolution surveillance network should not be approved for a residential area when the applicant has already failed to comply with privacy and planning rules.

<u>3M</u>

#### 8. Lack of Need and Overreaction to Low-Level Incidents

The justification for this surveillance relies on a small number of historic, low-level incidents. Nothing presented supports the need for permanent, industrial-grade monitoring. Safeguarding arguments are weak, especially as this land is not part of the main school campus. Many schools, including the one my daughter attended, safely use community fields with normal staff supervision and no CCTV.

<u>3M</u>

### 9. Stoke Lodge Is a Low-Crime Area and the Crime Data Used Is Misleading

The application relies on a generalised crime map covering a large area, including the nearby Co-op, where shoplifting and minor incidents account for most of the recorded offences. These figures do not reflect Stoke Lodge itself. The fields have always been a low-crime, peaceful community asset.

Using wider neighbourhood crime to justify permanent 24/7 surveillance of open green space is misleading and disproportionate. Nothing presented demonstrates a crime pattern at Stoke Lodge or any need for this scale of surveillance.

<u>3M</u>

# 10. Harm to Residential Amenity and the Character of the Area

The development would significantly affect our home and the quiet, residential character of the lane. The poles introduce industrial structures into a green, heritage landscape and increase the sense of enclosure created by the fencing. The combined effect is harmful to outlook, amenity and the overall feel of the neighbourhood.

<u>3M</u>

### Conclusion

### This proposal would:

- place our home and lane under constant surveillance,
- cause a serious loss of privacy,
- introduce intrusive industrial structures into a heritage landscape,
- overlook and obstruct public rights of way,

- threaten wildlife and TPO-protected trees,
- rely on misleading and disproportionate justification,
- and come from an applicant with a history of unauthorised camera use.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask the Planning Inspectorate to refuse this application.

Yours sincerely Ian Chinnock