

[REDACTED]

From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
Sent: 03 July 2026 05:18
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: Montserrat Bartlett
From:

Beresford Avenue
High peak
Chapel en le frith

Phone:

Email: [REDACTED]

Submission: Objection

Comments: I wish to formally object to the proposed development for the following reasons:

The architectural design of the proposed buildings is wholly inappropriate and fails to respect Buxton's unique heritage. The scale and density of the development are excessive, resulting in an overbearing presence that would significantly alter the character of the town. The site lies in close proximity to the Grade I listed Crescent, the Grade II* Devonshire Dome, and several other architecturally significant buildings. As such, the proposals require far greater sensitivity and consideration in their design to complement the surrounding historic environment. Buxton is a historic spa and tourist destination, and this development risks diminishing its distinct identity, making it resemble any other modern town. I strongly object on these grounds.

There are also plans to demolish existing premises occupied by Next, New Look, and Nationwide. The loss of these businesses would be detrimental to the town centre and could result in job losses. Retaining existing shops must be a priority. I would strongly oppose their demolition unless equivalent premises are made available and operational within the new development prior to any closures.

Furthermore, Buxton does not require additional coffee shops or food outlets. There are already numerous vacant units along Spring Gardens, which should be prioritised for occupancy before introducing new retail spaces. I therefore object to the inclusion of further retail or dining units within the development.

The proposed housing provision is also a concern. The majority of properties are intended for rental, offering little opportunity for local residents, particularly younger people, to purchase their own homes. The proportion of affordable housing is minimal. I object to this imbalance and urge that a greater number of genuinely affordable, purchasable homes be included.

During the initial consultation, there was mention of incorporating a new museum and library within the development. While a potential space for a museum appears to have been identified, there is no firm commitment. Similarly, earlier proposals included a cinema, which is now absent from the plans. It remains unclear what facilities are being provided for young people in Buxton.

Accessibility is another significant issue. The design includes numerous steps, making it unsuitable for individuals with mobility impairments. The provision of a single lift is inadequate, particularly given the frequency with which lifts can be out of service. The design of the lift structure itself is also visually unappealing and highly prominent. I also object to any visible Capital & Centric branding on the buildings, especially atop the lift structure, due to its impact on views from historic areas.

Parking provision is being substantially reduced, from 422 spaces to 260. This reduction is insufficient to accommodate residents, workers, and visitors. Additional disabled parking spaces are also required. Given the unreliable nature of local public transport, many residents rely on cars for commuting and daily activities. Reduced parking, particularly around the Waitrose area, would be unacceptable.

The proposed relocation of parking to the DB Schenker site would require visitors to walk further into town, which may discourage shoppers. It would be more appropriate to consider residential development on that land instead, while retaining existing parking provision. In addition, the proposed use of Palace Road as an access route raises serious safety concerns, as exiting onto the main road is already hazardous. This would require careful reconsideration and likely a separate planning application.

The construction period, estimated at up to five years, would cause prolonged disruption to the town and may result in the closure of existing businesses. It is questionable whether such disruption is justified for what is effectively a large-scale housing development.

There is also insufficient clarity regarding public amenities. In particular, it is unclear how many public toilets will be provided. Given that this was identified as a key priority during consultation, the development should include ample facilities, including accessible and changing places toilets.

Finally, the impact on local services must be addressed. An additional 328 households will place increased demand on doctors, dentists, and schools, yet no clear provision has been outlined. Similarly, it is unclear where employment opportunities will arise for new residents.

Overall, I believe this proposal represents an overdevelopment driven primarily by commercial interests rather than the needs of the community. The scale of the housing has increased significantly since initial consultations, and I believe further consultation is required before proceeding.

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>
