

From: [Russell Wickens](#)
To: [Section 62A Applications Non Major](#)
Cc: [Russell Wickens](#)
Subject: S62A/2025/0133 Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, Parry's Lane, BS9
Date: 04 December 2025 10:17:49

To Whom It May Concern

There is a great deal of expert opinion expressed in opposition to this application all of which I have read and agree with. However, in addition I have a personal view.

The imposition of 8 separate masts (whatever colour they are painted) along with CCTV cameras – 3 per mast, is one of the most egregious invasions of my civil liberties and right to privacy that I have ever experienced. I am widely travelled in both Russia and China to name but two places where I would have expected such behaviour and this proposal at least merits comparison. There are several contentious areas:

-

Crime

Spurious arguments are being advanced that are based on flawed and deliberately misleading data. The 400-metre diameter model shows exactly how to pretend that crime exists where there is none. The only exceptions to this are 2 places where fence panels have been removed (but not stolen) because the access gate had been deliberately padlocked shut. I do not condone this behaviour but neither do I condone the baseless lies that have accompanied this allegation. Otherwise, the evidence is solidly in favour of law-abiding citizens going about their business lawfully on the site and using the Public Rights Of Way across it.

The applicant has provided what it describes as a schedule of the reported crimes. All but one of these dates from the lockdown period or shortly afterwards, when Cotham School took the decision to lock local residents out of Stoke Lodge Playing Fields despite the terms of its lease and pleas from local and national politicians. Several of these incidents do not appear to be crimes at all: the incidents in June 2020 relate to young children playing football – i.e. the community simply using the fields (it is not clear why this was reported to the police). It is troubling that the school has monitored and retained CCTV of this activity. I repeat that this level of intrusiveness is unacceptable.

CCTV Cameras

Aside from the unnecessary installation of these cameras and their intrusive, unwarranted privacy invasion their entrenched cabling will devastate the ground for a considerable distance including unavoidable damage to TPO protected trees and their roots. The cameras – 3 per mast not one – will have the ability to see into surrounding houses and their gardens. That is unacceptable on every level. There is no basis in fact to justify the installation of even one. The applicant states that it does not need to demonstrate necessity for the CCTV, but has gone into some detail nonetheless about the alleged need to monitor pupils 100% of the time despite them never being unsupervised on the site. Any risks of assault/abduction of pupils are completely unfounded, particularly in BS9 which has one of the lowest crime rates in Bristol.

Submission

The submission is flawed on several levels including that it shows the boundary lines incorrectly drawn. Furthermore, the applicant should have included all the mature parkland trees around

the site for the purposes of its habitat baseline calculation (as well as the other habitats within the redline) and provide at least a 10% gain in biodiversity. It does not.

In summary, the application is incorrectly submitted and should be refused. However, the unconscionable invasion of personal privacy should be reason enough on its own to throw it out.

Kind regards,

Russell Wickens