

From: [sue tranter](#)
To: [Section 62A Applications Non Major](#)
Subject: Objection to Planning Application S62A/2025/0133 – Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene, Shirehampton, Bristol BS9 2BH
Date: 05 December 2025 09:59:48

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

Objection to Planning Application S62A/2025/0133

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to object to the planning application by Cotham School for the installation of eight 6-metre CCTV poles, each fitted with three cameras, at Stoke Lodge Playing Fields.

My family (Children and Grand Children) use the public rights of way that cross the Land on a very regular basis. I am extremely concerned about the impact this will have on our privacy and do not give permission for any of us to be filmed. This proposal is a continuation of the bullying and intimidation that I feel the school has directed at me including having security guards approach me telling me I have to get off the land when using my Public Right of Way.

Here are more specific thoughts:

1. Impact on Public Rights of Way and Amenity

The playing fields contain four public rights of way, approved by Bristol City Council and awaiting confirmation by the Planning Inspectorate (ROW/3363939). These paths are not “adjacent” to the site, as the applicant claims, but run directly across it. At least one proposed pole (Camera 5) would obstruct a right of way, contrary to Defra Rights of Way Circular 1/09, which requires applicants to identify and address impacts on rights of way. The application fails to do this.

The National Planning Policy Framework and local policy DM17 protect the amenity and enjoyment of public open space. Continuous monitoring of every movement across these paths is disproportionate and will discourage public use.

2. Privacy

This constant filming of this site undermines Article 8 ECHR rights to respect for private and family life.

The ICO) Code of Practice on Surveillance Cameras emphasise that CCTV must be necessary, proportionate, and

respect privacy – this clearly isn't the case.

The playing fields are a shared community space – not a fully owned playing field for the school.

3. Untruths

Cotham claims CCTV is “necessary” for safeguarding, but Ofsted guidance

confirms there is no statutory requirement for detached playing fields to be fenced or

monitored by CCTV. BS9 has one of the lowest crime rates in Bristol and I note that the

crime figures that Cotham have quoted extend beyond the playing field and cover local

shops etc – deliberately misleading the case.

4. Visual Impact

The poles will be highly visible, three times the height of the existing fence, and

positioned in open areas, including near the Tree of Life sculpture and other heritage

features. This is contrary to local and national policies requiring development to

respect the character of heritage landscapes.

In summary

These are the following policies that will be broken if you authorise Cotham to continue with this plan:

- Defra Rights of Way Circular 1/09 (failure to address rights of way impacts)
- ICO Surveillance Camera Code of Practice (lack of necessity and proportionality)
- Local Plan Policy DM17 (protection of Important Open Space)
- Policies BCS21, BCS22, DM26, DM27, DM31 (heritage and design)
- Article 8 ECHR (privacy rights)

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the application be refused.

Many thanks

Sue Tranter