

From: [Nimisha Birmingham](#)
To: [Section 62A Applications Non Major](#)
Subject: S62A/2025/0133 Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene, Shirehampton, Bristol BS9 2BH
Date: 03 December 2025 21:02:26

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

Dear Section 62A Applications Team,

I am writing to object to planning application **S62A/2025/0133** for eight 6-metre CCTV poles at **Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene, Shirehampton, Bristol BS9 2BH**. If a hearing is held, I would like to **speak**.

Reasons for Objection

Visual and Heritage Harm

Stoke Lodge is a historic parkland setting linked to a Grade II listed building. The installation of eight industrial-scale poles would be visually intrusive, urbanising and harmful to the setting, contrary to local and national heritage policies. A single pole was previously refused — this proposal is significantly more damaging.

[REDACTED]

Longstanding Community Use

I have personally used Stoke Lodge since [REDACTED], initially with my husband, and since [REDACTED] as a family [REDACTED]. When he was younger, we used the play park regularly. Now, at age [REDACTED], he enjoys running and playing football there — activities that support his physical and emotional health. This important open space has long been a welcoming environment for local residents.

Community Amenity and Rights of Way

Four public rights of way cross the land. Poles will obstruct routes and their surveillance will reduce the enjoyment of the parkland, against policies protecting public open space and recreation.

Ecological and Tree Impact

Protected parkland trees are at risk from trenching and from future pressure to maintain camera sight lines. The arboricultural report does not assess the actual proposed cabling route and is therefore not reliable.

Disproportionate Scale and No Proven Need

The school only uses part of the site for short, supervised PE lessons, and already benefits from existing CCTV. There is no evidence of crime or safeguarding risk to justify permanent industrial structures across the entire park.

Invalid and Inconsistent Submission

Plans contradict each other on boundaries, cable routes and camera locations. Rights of way have not been properly acknowledged. The heritage information is inaccurate. The application is not robust enough for approval.

Policy Conflict

The proposal conflicts with multiple policies and statutory duties, including:

- **Sections 66 and 72** of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 – requiring special regard to preserving the setting of listed buildings
- **NPPF Section 16** – which requires great weight to be given to conserving heritage assets
- **Bristol Local Plan** policies including:
 - **BCS21** (high-quality design and protection of amenity)
 - **BCS22** (conservation of heritage assets)
 - **DM17** (protection of Important Open Space – development must be ancillary, which 24/7 surveillance is not)
 - **DM26, DM27, DM31** (heritage, character and landscape protection)

The applicant has not demonstrated an overriding public benefit nor considered less harmful alternatives. As such, the proposal does **not comply** with adopted planning policy and should be refused.

Conclusion

The proposal would cause **clear and lasting harm** to heritage, visual amenity, community wellbeing, ecology, privacy and public access — without meaningful public benefit.

I therefore **respectfully request refusal**.

If permission were ever considered, it should only be temporary and subject to strict conditions.

Thank you for considering my objection.

Yours faithfully,

Nimisha Birmingham

[Redacted Signature]