

From: [Rachel Rogers](#)
To: [Section 62A Applications Non Major](#)
Subject: Objection to Application Reference Number S62A/2025/0133 - Site Address - Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene, Shirehampton, Bristol BS9 2BH
Date: 03 December 2025 12:21:28

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

To whom it may concern,

We are writing to register a formal objection to the proposed installation of CCTV cameras—and in particular Camera [REDACTED] on a 6-metre pole—at Lower Ebenezer Lane. This objection is grounded in material planning considerations and relevant legislation.

1. Severe Privacy Intrusion

Camera [REDACTED] would have a direct line of sight into our garden at [REDACTED] and, in some instances, into our windows. This is confirmed by the applicant's own coverage diagrams and visual mock-ups. Each pole will carry three high-resolution cameras providing 360° coverage and facial-recognition-level clarity well beyond the indicated "red zones". As a result, our private home life would be subject to continual monitoring, contrary to Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998 and policy BCS21, which requires the protection of the amenity of existing development.

The application vaguely references "privacy screening" but provides no enforceable detail on:

- A) what privacy-zone options will be used
- B) how accurate or reliable they are
- C) who will control them
- D) how compliance will be verified, especially after software updates
- E) will manual overrides to the privacy zone but possible.

Without binding planning conditions and a physical screen, these assurances are ineffective. The ICO has previously required the removal of covert cameras from this site, demonstrating a history of non-compliance.

2. Impact on Family Life

The proposal would fundamentally alter how our family uses our home and garden. The knowledge that our private space could be viewed at any time creates a persistent sense of intrusion and being watched. Everyday activities—children playing outside, family BBQs, or simply relaxing—would feel like we're being watched and intruded upon. This is a significant and unreasonable interference with our ability to enjoy our home, contrary to Article 8 ECHR and local policies protecting residential amenity. The psychological impact of living under potential surveillance is intimidating and wholly disproportionate to any claimed benefit.

3. Disproportionate and Unnecessary Surveillance

The school states that CCTV is required for safeguarding, yet pupils are always supervised

by staff and the field is used only for short, timetabled lessons. Monitoring 100% of a 22-acre field, 24 hours a day, is excessive and fails the tests of necessity and proportionality set out in the Surveillance Camera Code of Practice.

4. Visual and Heritage Harm

A 6-metre pole would be visually intrusive from our property and nearby public rights of way, which will disturb the established heritage parkland landscape. This is at not in line with Sections 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the NPPF, and local policies DM17 and BCS22. The cumulative impact of eight poles would significantly erode the openness and amenity of this Important Open Space.

5. Lack of Enforceable Privacy Safeguards

The applicant's suggestion that residents may "view coverage after installation" does not constitute a legal safeguard. There is no mechanism for independent auditing or enforcement. Privacy zones can be overridden, reset, or fail following software updates, leaving residents exposed. This uncertainty is unacceptable and incompatible with obligations under the UK GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018.

Conclusion

The proposed CCTV installation—and specifically Camera [REDACTED]—would cause unacceptable harm to our residential privacy, family life, visual amenity, and the historic parkland setting, without any demonstrated necessity or enforceable mitigation. We therefore request that the application be refused in the strongest possible terms.

Regards,
Rachel and Paul Rogers

[REDACTED]