

From: [Nick Evans](#)
To: [Section 62A Applications Non Major](#)
Subject: Planning Objection S62A/2025/0133
Date: 04 December 2025 22:30:27

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

Objection to planning application for Stoke Lodge Playing Fields, West Dene,
Shirehamptom, Bristol BS9 2BH

My Details

Nick Evans
[REDACTED]

Objection to S62A/2025/0133

My objection

I would like to refer to crime statistics and the comments submitted by PC Allford.

The crime data cited in the police statement is not site-specific and is drawn from an area far larger than the application site. The statistics include incidents from the Adult Learning Centre building, its car park, areas outside the fields on nearby roads with parked vehicles, and the local Tesco and Coop, as well as surrounding residential and commercial locations. These areas are not part of the Stoke Lodge fields and therefore cannot reasonably be used to suggest any crime risk associated with the open space itself, the space that the cameras state will safeguard pupils within.

The report still fails to state which—if any—incidents occurred within the boundary of Stoke Lodge or on the open fields. Without this essential distinction, the figures are unsuitable as evidence of crime affecting the site.

It is also relevant to note that on 1st October 2024 at the Westbury on Trym Community Forum meeting, PC Allford reassured attendees that “violent crime... includes a range of offences from verbal abuse at home to violent behaviour in public. The vast majority of incidents are between people who know each other, and it is very rare for a member of the public to be involved.” This clarification directly contradicts any implication that the general crime statistics presented pose a significant risk to users of the open fields.

Despite this, his comments submitted to PINS include a series of supportive assertions regarding the proposed fencing and CCTV—yet none of these statements were informed by consultation with the local community, as PC Allford has not attended the Stoke Bishop Ward Forum and has no record of residents’ concerns. These unverified assertions include claims that:

- *“Repeated acts of vandalism have compromised the integrity of the fencing, resulting in financial costs for repairs and creating opportunities for further **anti-social behaviour**.”*
- *“These incidents disrupt the school’s ability to deliver outdoor education and undermine the sense of safety for pupils, staff, **and local residents**.”*
- *“The installation of CCTV would deter criminal activity, support evidence-gathering, **and provide community reassurance**.”*
- *“**Security measures are needed to protect public investment in the site**.”*

He states he is “committed” to working with....community stakeholders but as yet has not engaged with any community representatives for Stoke Lodge.

I do however agree that the site has indeed been used by the community and various sports clubs for the last two years safely with no fence and no requirement for CCTV.

His comments are presented as if they reflect local feelings, yet no engagement with the community took place, and no evidence has been provided to show that residents, users of the fields, or local groups agree with or support these views. In fact, many members of the community have consistently raised

concerns *opposing* fencing and enhanced security measures—concerns which cannot be acknowledged if the officer did not attend the Stoke Bishop public forum for these discussions.

It also omits the fact that "Education Land" includes community use under the lease that the applicant signed, not formal sports hire but use but informal use by the community.

Given the reliance on broad, non-site-specific statistics; the absence of evidence showing any crimes occurred within the Stoke Lodge boundary; the contradictions with PC Allford's own prior public reassurances; and the inclusion of supportive claims that were not verified through any community consultation, the police submission should be afforded minimal weight

I am happy to provide this evidence in person

Regards

Nick Evans

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)