



# Bray Parish Council

---

---

## Questions received for Extraordinary Planning Committee Meeting, Monday 8<sup>th</sup> February 2016 Grouped by Topic

Agenda Item	Question	Time allowed
7.1	<b>Choice of Site</b>  Samantha Thornton asked - What about the site in Stafferton Way? Why was that not a suitable site?  Rod Ball – OGFRA Chairman asked - How many other sites were considered and why were they not considered appropriate?  Charlotte Johnson asked - There has been much talk of more suitable alternative sites being rejected and the impending closure of the gym should planning be refused. Both statements are being used to fuel the argument. Please can the panel give us a straight answer - are there more suitable sites and will the gym be forced to shut its doors if planning is not forthcoming?  Helen Howard asked - Why has the applicant not submitted an updated detailed sequential testing report that takes into account that the proposed building has been significantly reduced and therefore what evidence does the applicant have to prove that there are no other sites in the Maidenhead/Windsor area where a building of this size is either available to rent or could be built thereby avoiding the need to develop on green belt land and avoiding increasing the risk of flooding and traffic problems?  <b>Question for the applicant is; Why has the applicant not submitted an updated detailed sequential testing report that takes into account that the proposed building has been significantly reduced and therefore what evidence can the applicant provide to show how many sites were considered and why the Stafferton Way site and other sites initially considered remain unsuitable?</b>	3 mins
7.2	<b>Water Oakley Site</b>  <b>Question for the applicant from Helen Howard is; Why is the applicant not seeking to get Farmglade to honour the offer they made in respect of the previous planning application for the Water Oakley site to provide the gym with a site either there or on other local land they own now they have been granted an extremely valuable planning permission?</b>	2 mins
7.3	<b>Green Belt</b>  Rod Ball – OGFRA Chairman asked - We have been in existence for 50 years protecting the Green Belt in this area. Why do you regard this application as a special case?  Esther& Christian Metcalfe asked - Why should Phoenix gymnastics club be allowed to build on green belt land, what are it's very special circumstances?  <b>Question for the applicant is;</b>	3 mins

**Why do you believe you should be allowed to build on green belt land and why do you regard this application as a special case?**  
7.4 **Future Development** 1 min

**Question for the applicant from Helen Howard is;**  
**Even though the proposed building has been significantly reduced since the original application, the area of the site has been increased, the length of the car park is the same and the siting of the front of the building is the same so there is plenty of space to submit a subsequent planning permission in the future to expand the gym and car park to the size of the original application. Therefore will the applicant reassure the local residents that there are no plans to expand the gym later by entering into a binding legal planning agreement that no further expansion from the current amended application will be allowed?**

7.5 **Flooding – SUDs** 3 mins

Rod Ball – OGFRA Chairman asked - Could you please confirm the effectiveness of the SUDs and why flooding is not considered a problem on this site?

Guy Johnson - With so much distorted and impassioned comment about the flooding in Fifield (which is not flooding caused by anything but the insufficient maintenance of culverts) can you strip it all away and simply explain how the SUDs will work and be to the benefit to certain parts of Fifield

Helen Howard asked - Given that the applicant's new Flood Risk Assessment includes the Environment Agency Risk of Flooding from Surface Water study for the area of the site and this shows there is a high risk of flooding on the site and along Fifield Road/Coningsby Lane, i.e. an annual risk of 1 in 30, and given the recent evidence of flooding outside the site and in Fifield in 2014 and 2016, why has their SUDs proposals to avoid increased flooding only been designed to cope with a 1 in 100 year flood which is obviously inadequate from a risk point of view?

**Question for the applicant is;**  
**Could you please explain why flooding is not considered a problem on this site, confirm how the SUDs will work, be to the benefit to certain parts of Fifield and the effectiveness of Suds taking into consideration that the proposal has only been designed to cope with a 1 in 100 year flood?**

7.6 **Drainage** 2 mins

Helen Howard asked - Why is there no report available from the independent drainage consultants previously appointed by the RBWM commenting on the amended plans but if one already exists what are its conclusions?

Helen Howard asked - Why has the applicant not provided all the reports and information that the independent drainage consultants previously appointed by the RBWM said needed to be submitted to support the application in their report to RBWM of October 2015?

**Question for the applicant is;**  
**Why has the applicant not provided for the amended plans all the reports and information that the independent drainage consultants previously appointed by the RBWM said needed to be submitted but if one exists, what are its conclusions?**

7.7 **Flood Prevention** 3 mins

**Questions for the applicant from Helen Howard are;**  
**How can the applicant claim there will be no increased risk of flooding where the main flood prevention proposal is the use of attenuation ponds which from local knowledge and in the opinion of the RBWM's Drainage**

**Officer will be full anyway due to the very high water table in the area and the fact that the site is based on clay so water will not disperse?**

**As any restriction of the drainage ditch alongside the front of site through installing a so called 'oversized drainage pipe' under the new access to the site will inevitably cause a high risk of increased flooding problems back into Fifield village, why has there not been proper proposals submitted to avoid this problem such as a bridge?**

7.8 **Site Modifications** 1 min

**Question for the applicant from Helen Howard is;  
Has the applicant consulted South East Water regarding their proposals due to the fact that a very large water pipe runs through the front corner of the site and part of the proposals is to build over a section of this pipe and if so have South East Water either confirmed they have no objections or if they have any objections are they requiring any modifications?**

7.9 **Traffic** 2 mins

Rod Ball – OGFRA Chairman asked - You say that traffic movements will remain as they are at the current location. What are your views on the impact of those movements on the proposed location?

Helen Howard asked - Why has the applicant not submitted a proper traffic study combining up to date traffic data for the existing gym with the existing traffic flows in Fifield village and the projected traffic flows which also takes into account the existing traffic problems where the Fifield Road joins the A308 and the high use of Fifield Road for horses and pedestrians?

**Question for the applicant is;  
As a proper traffic study combining up to date traffic data for the existing gym with the existing traffic flows in Fifield village and the projected traffic flows which also takes into account the existing traffic problems where the Fifield Road joins the A308 and the high use of Fifield Road for horses and pedestrians has not been submitted, how can you confirm that that traffic movements will remain as they are at the current location and what are your views on the impact of those movements on the proposed location?**

7.10 **Events at Phoenix Gym** 1 min

Graeme Wilcock asked – There appears to be concerns about lots of additional events taking place.

**Question for the applicant is;  
Approximately how many times per year would you envisage running competitions or putting on shows meaning additional traffic?**

7.11 **Risk Assessment** 1 min

**Question for the applicant from Helen Howard is;  
Have the Trustees of the Phoenix Gym taken advice about the real risk that as the building is being built on an area of clay over gravel that when there is the planned deep excavation of the gravel alongside the site there could be a major lateral land slip onto the gravel pit?**

7.12 **Advice and support received** 1 min

David Short – Downs Place Residents Association asked - Have you (the Gym) received any help or advice from the following; Bray Parish Council, Farmglade, Any other organisation in the Parish of Bray?

Tony Bennett asked - Do you believe individual councillors of RBWM support the work and achievements that Phoenix, as a charity, has achieved in the borough

for the past 36 years? How have those who support the club made it known?

**Question for the applicant is;**

**What help, advice or support have you received from RBWM Councillors, Bray Parish Council, Farmglade, or any other organisation in the Parish of Bray and have those involved made this public?**

7.13 **Future of Phoenix Gym**

1 min

Charlotte Johnson asked - There has been much talk of more suitable alternative sites being rejected and the impending closure of the gym should planning be refused. Both statements are being used to fuel the argument. Please can the panel give us a straight answer - are there more suitable sites and will the gym be forced to shut its doors if planning is not forthcoming?

**Question for the applicant is;**

**Will the gym be forced to close its doors if planning is not forthcoming?**

7.14 **Lack of support for Phoenix Gym from Bray Parish Council**

2 mins

Alex Johnson asked - I am 17 and about to go off to university in September to study sport science. Sport is my passion and it all started at Phoenix.

**Question for Bray Parish Council is;**

**I do not understand why Bray parish are not supportive of Phoenix.**