
From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
Sent: 15 March 2023 17:50
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

Categories:

Application Reference No. : HPK/2023/0005 Site Address: Buxton Press Ltd Palace Road Buxton Derbyshire SK17 6AE Buxton Comments by: J Knox

From:

The Cairn
Palace Road
Buxton
Buxton
Derbyshire
SK176AF

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Neither

Comments: Proposal by Buxton Press to vary the conditions relating to

¿Extension to paper storage and new roof over existing 1st floor office ¿

Condition seeking variation -reduce parking spaces from 40 to 25 . A reduction of 15 spaces

Questions

what are the original conditions attached to the initial primary application concerning the surrounding environment. That is , on what basis was the original planning application granted and what were the conditions attached as it would appear there have been more than one planning application granted to the Buxton Press

What were the original considerations included in the primary plan and approved in relation to operating activities, forklift truck turning ,lorry turning , highway safety ,storage , operational hours and parking.

Reason given by The Buxton Press for conditions to be removed /changed:-

¿Reduce parking due to fewer staff and to facilitate safer fork lift handling of daily deliveries ¿ it has never been the case that the Press has not used a forklift so why would a variation be needed now?

Looking at the plans submitted as ¿current¿ and ¿proposed¿-

Area A - the parking spaces have already been removed and some of this area is being used as storage outside , so not a permanent structure but permanently occupied by goods and materials being delivered to The Press. The proposal made by The Press fails to recognise this and instead claims the parking spaces are needed only for forklift truck manoeuvres.

Area C - The spaces have a permanent structure built on them and the spaces have been removed already. The Press has not made any mention of this structure in its application. They are currently in breach of their planning permission as they have built permanent structures over the parking spaces.

This appears to be a retrospective planning application but fails to mention the points regarding areas A and C above or to seek retrospective permission for those alternative uses.

The application made by The Press claims granting permission would increase road safety through 'facilitating safer forklift handling' clearly neither of the above current uses of parking spaces meets that claim.

Whilst A would be clearly useful as a loading/ unloading bay it is not sufficient because :

the constant use of some of area A as storage space means there is insufficient space for the long trucks to park without overlapping on to the pavement or on to the highway. The practice Buxton Press has adopted to do this by removing the parking spaces in order to use this area as a loading bay has created a hazard as it is not possible to walk past safely without finding yourself in the road when deliveries are taking place.

The damage caused to the highway has created further hazards because the current practice of using A as a loading bay for long trucks has caused potholes in the road outside the Cairn where the trucks thump down off the pavement after turning in Area A , damage to the telegraph pole and to the council litter bin on Palace Road opposite area A and danger to pedestrians due to trucks having to mount the pavement outside Dovedale and The Cairn in order to leave the Press. Removal of those 12 parking spaces has not increased road safety in any way, in fact it has had the opposite effect.

Perhaps the proposal is to move the loading area to the back of the building ? (The proposal is not clear as to where the forklift activity is proposed to take place) In which case , this will be a much better proposal than the current dangerous practice because all of the activities would be completely off the highway and pavements and would not cause further damage and would remove the current dangerous practices because they would take place entirely on the Buxton Press premises.

Area B - the proposal provides for 2 additional spaces This is good as the business has failed to provide adequate car spaces for current use by its staff and visitors. The parking wardens have been issuing tickets to staff because they have been parking opposite the Press on palace road on yellow lines and also mounting the pavement.

The staff also use the parking spaces on palace road as The Press do not have enough spaces for their shift work staff.

The lorries serving the Press also park along Palace Road waiting to deliver or to stop for a break before or after delivery, even on occasion to sleep in. This is a single and double line area. There is also a junction with Lascelles Road and a bend in Palace Road.

2 houses in particular (1 and 3 Station cottages) are used all the time as parking places by big lorries. The owners are constantly asking the Press to stop this antisocial and dangerous practice by their suppliers.

The council has in the past asked the press to ask the lorries to wait in the lorry park in Buxton but this no longer happens, the problem still exists . Removing any additional parking facilities at The Press will not help to either increase safety or address the staff parking under provision problem.

I am currently looking at a lorry double parked outside the press as cars mount the pavement to pass it while it waits to unload. It is so long it cannot manoeuvre in to the Press without mounting the pavement and when parked in Area A it will spill into the road.

Palace Road has a school on it with the entrance opposite The Press . At school start and end , the lorries, parents , children arriving and leaving already cause congestion and illegal parking practices due to insufficient provision and occupation of space by The Press staff and deliveries.

Why have the School, Openreach or the Post Office not been included in consultation? .

The expansion by The Press by building in Area C for new plant and equipment, having more traffic visiting due to staff doing shift work and more lorries arriving to deliver gas increased the pressure on the few parking spaces in palace road .

Residents have seen an erosion of their right to quiet enjoyment of their properties as The Press has expanded its operations in increased activity. There is a clear argument for increasing parking provision to help the Press operate safely. The proposal does nothing to alleviate the currently unsafe and damaging practices of the traffic relating to The Press.

How much money is the council willing to spend repairing the potholes, fixing the bins and poles damaged by the Press and allowing unsafe practices to continue . This is a serious accident waiting to happen.

While it's great to see success , it's time for the Press to find more suitable premises. Perhaps consideration could be made by the council to grant them residential planning permission (thereby increasing the value of the premises significantly) which would help them fund a move to more suitable business premises. I realise this is not a proposal that the council can consider her but it would appear to be a good long term solution for an ever expanding and busy business which is clearly expanding rapidly year on year .

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>
