

[REDACTED]

From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
Sent: 02 July 2026 11:42
To: Planning Comments (HPBC)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access

[REDACTED]

Application Reference No. : HPK/2026/0228 Site Address: Spring Shopping Centre & Land South of Station Road
Buxton Derbyshire Comments by: Susan Wolton

From:
58 Lightwood Road
Hayfield Rd
Corbar
Buxton
Derbyshire.
SK17 7BB

[REDACTED]

Submission: Objection
Comments: Dear Sir/Madam,

I object to the proposals by the developer for the following reasons:

1. The Scheme was originally conveyed as being a "regeneration" of the Springs, which continues to have numerous empty units and upper floor of units not being used (a notable exception being the use of one as a Cannabis farm) for constructive purposes.

The public toilets once available in the former cafe unit next to Next have laid un-used for some years now. In spite of constant recognition of the need for more public toilet facilities and the token "commitment" to address this issue by HPBC.

Instead, the original goal has morphed into a huge, residential development by a private developer. And - let's cut to the chase - their motivations is to squeeze every inch of land, not for the benefit of the Buxton community, but for their "bottom line". Not a penny of which will enhance Buxton. Instead, this planned over-development is very likely to bring chaos to Buxton for many years. Inevitably, costs will rise and corners will be cut.

So, we have a private developer who initially stated it would enhance the local economy bringing leisure facilities, revitalising the Wye front to create an attractive facility for residents and visitors alike. Trees and seating facilities galore. An improvement on the existing concrete mess. But, clearly, profit motive has reigned supreme and for "viability" reasons, the number of units proposed has increased, in an apparent random fashion, and currently stands at 327 flats plus a terrace of 5 town houses. This number is far too high.

I understand that the Council is being pressurised by unrealistic demands by Central Gov to build, baby build, but this has to be done in a sustainable and beneficial way. The current figure is clearly gross over development. The car parking requirements of visitors to the town centre and those needed by future residents just doesn't seem to have been thought through.

2. Destruction of woodland: I gather the lovely woodland behind the train station is going to be re purposed to access the land (former sheds) for additional car parking. I have long thought that section of land would make good low level, childless couple, accommodation, without the necessary destruction of much needed / valued green space & habitat. I am not against in town development which is generally more sustainable than out of town etc. so this patch of land would be ideal for those who live and work in Buxton. Who could walk to town, or to public transport. This is much closer to a viable, sustainable development that would meet the needs for affordable housing.

3. Affordability: the Council often makes quite a song and dance about requiring "affordable" housing and quite rightly. Why, on this occasion, is this requirement suddenly not a priority? Who will occupy these 327 flats and houses? Are all the planned, vacant units in the massive Harpur Hill development now sold and occupied? What is the evidence that there is the demand in an area where there is a distinct lack of jobs? Travel to other areas, eg Stockport / Manchester etc. is costly by train and is not in line with Council concern around Climate Change if people drive, creating even greater traffic congestion and pollution along the route. Take the bottle neck along Fairfield Road and the concern with air quality there. More traffic here is again, going to disadvantage the most disadvantaged in Buxton who are currently living along this stretch.

4. Impact on existing businesses: we all know that local businesses are struggling with ever increasing costs levied against the people who work hard, who invest in the area and who employ people, thus creating wealth. On top of that, key businesses, such as Waitrose and Next are clearly threatened. What consultation has been undertaken with them? These stores attract visitors into town and help to stimulate other expenditure. We cannot afford to lose the jobs and economic benefit they bring to Buxton so that a private developer can maximise their profit margins while Buxton becomes poorer for it. We endured the loss of Marks and Spencer - (some of us have still not fully recovered from the sad departure of this store from Buxton!) We can ill do with Next / Waitrose deciding that Buxton is just not creating a positive environment for them. I suspect those who are currently employed by them would also agree.

5. Traffic chaos. If HPBC is genuinely concerned about welfare / health / climate change / quality of life, then can I suggest that clogging up the centre of Buxton with more traffic is not the way forward. Reducing the number of parking spaces for public will result in people scrambling around for other parking nearby. As a near by resident, I can tell you that already people park outside houses in the lower end of Lightwood Rd in order to walk in to town. I have been unable to park anywhere near my own home on occasions due to over demand on space. The road is narrow and gets very congested at times. Air quality is then compromised. I do not want to see the Council then raising further revenue by imposing parking permits for which astronomical prices are then charged. Again, residents bearing the cost of the developer's profit.

6. Consultation: I did go along to the open shop "consultation". I can't remember what number of units / parking was, at that time, proposed. What I do recall was that we were invited to put sticky paper onto the wall for the developers / councils to then ignore. What I do know is that 3 Labour Councillors have resigned over the lack of open, transparent consultancy and have suggested that the Council has too much invested in the Scheme and is perhaps not as impartial as it could be when assessing the pros and cons. This clearly raises great big red flags and does not inspire confidence in the proposals or the Council's approach.

Finally, if the Scheme is to go ahead (and when has consultation ever really been listened to?), then I would urge for a greatly reduced number of units to be agreed; that existing businesses are treated with respect and given priority

in agreeing how their interests (and those of their employees) can be protected; that the wooded area behind the train station be seen as an asset in its own right and not destroyed; that demands for the greening of the space is given priority; that there are distinct benefits to the public (not just the developer) and that there are strict time-tables re. the development to minimise the inevitable chaos and disruptions; that disabled parking spaces are preserved.

Thank you.

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>
