

From: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: FW: Comment Received from Public Access

-----Original Message-----

From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk [mailto:planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk]
Sent: Monday, May 07, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : HPK/2018/0120 Site Address: Former bottling plant Station Road Buxton Derbyshire SK17 6AQ Buxton

Comments by: Guy Dunkn/a

From:
2
Kents Bank Road
Cote Heath
Buxton
Derbyshire
SK17 9HJ

Submission: Objection

Comments: I object to the following planning applications HPK/2018/0120, HPK/2018/0125 & also HPK/2018/0124 & wish to raise the following points for consideration:

¿ Station Road, especially for eastbound traffic, is one of the busiest roads in Buxton. Traffic standstills are virtually a daily occurrence, sometimes with traffic backing up along St. Johns Road as far as Burlington Road & beyond. How many missed/late doctors¿ appointments will result? How much delay to ambulances will be caused? The stationary motor vehicle traffic will raise air pollution levels, especially as most vehicle catalyst & filter systems work best when engines are above idling speed.

¿ The centralisation of GP services will result in more unnecessary car traffic as people tend to sign up to their nearest surgery. I have received no consultation from my local GP, despite being one of the practices affected. When I enquired at the surgery, the staff had no information & said that the proposals were still to be discussed with DCHS. Getting to the proposed hospital from the south side of town will be more time consuming too ¿ Buxton Cottage Hospital is a far better site and there is empty land adjacent that could be developed for NHS use. The Bedford site would be a far better bet for a care home, with Elmwood, Temple & Stewart Medical Centres in the near vicinity. I doubt DCHS has any agreements to move GP services in the town & if these planning applications are allowed, in my opinion, the GP practices will need to be either need to be financially encouraged to move ¿ or browbeaten into doing so. Perhaps a better use of scarce NHS financial resources would be to staff existing hospitals properly? Also, much of the growth of housing in Buxton will be to the south of the town ¿ it seems perverse to move the hospital further away from these developments.

¿ DCHS does not have the consent of Buxton¿s population for these proposals ¿ a proper, widely advertised consultation is needed, which should include a communication to each person on a GP¿s patient list directly affected.

¿ Due to noise & air pollution issues, the proposed care home residents may need to be sealed into their building, since opening windows may cause problems to those with respiratory diseases.

¿ The two pillars of Buxton's economy are quarrying & tourism - the railways are vital for the former & could be a major factor in improving the latter. For instance, the restored Crescent 5 star spa hotel will need to run at high capacity, if it is to be sustained. Buxton's weather can be very daunting for long periods at a time & there needs to be more activities directed to our visitors' needs, lest they will be discouraged from returning. A steam heated railway carriage is the perfect way for old & young, able & disabled, to see our stunning scenery when the rain comes down in sheets or snow threatens.

¿ The proper use for the Buxton Water site is to return it to its original railway use (from 1863 to 1967) for extension of Peak Rail's land to allow longer trains, provide additional parking for Buxton's Network Rail & Peak Rail's operations. Peak Rail had ownership of this site until early 1990's, but at the time British Rail were obstructive about using the Ashwood Dale line & in the face of indifference (or sometimes downright hostility) from certain quarters, they had to use the money from the land sale to start again from the southern end of the line. Network Rail are much more co-operative & for instance they allow North Yorkshire Moors Railway to run extend their Pickering to Grosmont trains to Whitby along National network rails.

¿ I urge all the tourism stakeholders, including councillors & council officers to visit, say, Bridgnorth Minehead or Swanage & see what benefits to the local economy accrue where a heritage railway is nurtured by the local authorities. Re-opening the line to from Buxton to Matlock would far surpass any of its rivals & with national rail connections at both ends, play a part in keeping motor vehicle traffic to manageable levels.

¿ Far-fetched as it may seem now, I also believe that the site of the former Buxton Station to Hogshaw Viaduct curve should remain unbuilt on as it could be used to re-open the Dowlow line to passengers as far as the Longnor Road (Brierlow Bar), as this could be an answer to the increasing traffic congestion on the A515, which will only get worse with the new housing developments.

¿ I have no wish to seem unkind, especially as I'm approaching decrepitude myself, but to put the elderly & sick at the heart of a major tourist destination seems perverse, to say the least.

¿ Street Scene (409956). There are two grade II listed structures in this area: Buxton Station & Hogshaw Viaduct, both constructed by the same company (London & North Western Railway - once the largest joint stock company in the world) These structures now form a harmonious street scene & the proposed care home obliterates the view from one to another.

¿ Fine words about taking cues from Buxton existing architecture are no disguise for the brutalist designs. The proposed care home in particular is spectacularly ugly, merely compounding the mistakes made in the 1980's with the externally hideous Springs Shopping Centre opposite.

¿ Although built on Roman foundations & developed in the late 18th Century, Buxton, as a tourist destination & as a centre to the surrounding limestone quarries is essentially a railway town. The Pavilion Gardens complex, most of the hotels, the Dome and much of the layout of the town are as a result of the coming of the railways in 1863 (with additions around 1890).

¿ The frequency of the rail service from Buxton Station to Manchester will double to half-hourly in May. The trains used will most likely be the current type built in the mid nineteen eighties, with diesel engines complying with pollution legislation from that era. The amount of noise & vibration per hour will double, especially from trains departing. Diesel engines tend to give more pollution when they have been idling at the station & then worked hard as the trains accelerate uphill & the partially combusted fuel is cleared by the exhaust.

¿ Extract from Buxton Sidings decision letter (DoT 26th October 2018) Clause 6 follows: Although no increase in production was proposed at the Hindlow quarry at the time of the application, NR stated that the scheme would provide a future opportunity to increase the amount of material transported to and from that quarry by train.

¿ Trains run loaded in both directions including stone from Tunstead going to Dowlow for lime production. These trains will be noisier if they are longer, as the engines will be working harder. There doesn't appear to have been proper consultation with the freight rail operators who I believe to be Freightliner & DB Schenker. Please note that their freight services are a 24/7 operation.

¿ Not on any of the maps is the Peak Rail site indicated as such ¿ this appears to be misinformation by omission - indeed one map {409962 boundary treatments} incorrectly names the eastern care home/Peak Rail Boundary as care home /NHS boundary. There appears to be no means of access to the Peak Rail site, including the ability to let low loaders to move rolling stock or passengers to enter & exit the site.

¿ There is no mention of any future Peak Rail operations in the Noise & Vibration Assessments. Peak Rail have a Light Railway Order for their site & any development on the site cannot & should not be allowed to curtail or otherwise affect their future operations in any way.

In conclusion, this scheme is flawed, both from a health & economic perspective & should be rejected ¿ or at least, a full public enquiry be instigated.